

San Francisco Groundwater Master Plan



SEP 14 1999

UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA

*Prepared by
San Francisco Public Utilities Commission*

May 1997

00 00007
F I N A L

San Francisco Groundwater Master Plan



*Prepared by
San Francisco Public Utilities Commission*

May 1997



Digitized by the Internet Archive
in 2025 with funding from
State of California and California State Library

<https://archive.org/details/C124922595>

Table of Contents

Acknowledgments

Acronyms and Abbreviations

Glossary

Executive Summary ES-1

1 Introduction 1-1

Board of Supervisors Ordinances..... 1-1

Groundwater Master Plan Overview 1-3

Goals..... 1-9

Long-Term Strategies..... 1-9

Short-Term Activities..... 1-9

Groundwater Master Plan Organization..... 1-10

2 San Francisco Water Resources..... 2-1

Historical, Current, and Projected Future Water Supply and Demand..... 2-2

Location of In-City Water Demand 2-4

The City's Current Water Supply System 2-6

Groundwater Resources 2-7

Estimated Average Annual Recharge 2-8

Development Potential 2-8

Likely Groundwater Quality 2-8

Amount of Groundwater Extracted from Basin..... 2-9

Evaluation of Groundwater Resources and Water Demand 2-9

3 Goal 1: Protect and Enhance Groundwater Quality 3-1

Strategy 1A: Prevent Saltwater Intrusion..... 3-1

Activity 1A1 3-2

	Page
Activity 1A2.....	3-4
Strategy 1B: Reduce Risk of Future Groundwater Contamination	3-5
Activity 1B1	3-6
Strategy 1C: Increase Hydrologic Data Regarding City's Groundwater Resource	3-8
Activity 1C1	3-9
4 Goal 2: Coordinate Groundwater Use	4-1
Strategy 2A: Establish SFPUC as Lead in City Groundwater Management	4-1
Activity 2A1	4-1
Strategy 2B: Improve Coordination with Other Government Agencies Regulating/Affecting Groundwater Use Within the City.....	4-3
Activity 2B1	4-4
Strategy 2C: Improve Coordination with Adjacent Entities Whose Groundwater Use Affects Shared Groundwater Basins	4-4
Activity 2C1	4-4
Strategy 2D: Enhance Communication with City Water Customers	4-6
Activity 2D1	4-6
5 Goal 3: Protect and Conserve Related Water Resources	5-1
Strategy 3A: Manage Lake Water Levels	5-1
Activity 3A1	5-2
Activity 3A2	5-6
Activity 3A3	5-7
Activity 3A4	5-7
Strategy 3B: Manage Stream Water Levels	5-8
Activity 3B1	5-8
Activity 3B2	5-8
Activity 3B3	5-8

	Page
6	Goal 4: Improve Ability to Deliver Water During Emergencies6-1
	Strategy 4A: Evaluate Use of Groundwater as an Emergency Reserve.....6-1
	Activity 4A16-2
	Activity 4A26-3
	Activity 4A36-3
7	Goal 5: Maximize Groundwater Use7-1
	Potential Groundwater Users7-1
	Strategy 5A: Capture Groundwater Outflow to the San Francisco Bay or Pacific Ocean7-5
	Activity 5A17-9
	Activity 5A27-10
	Strategy 5B: Capture Groundwater Produced by Dewatering Operations.....7-11
	Activity 5B17-13
	Activity 5B27-13
	Activity 5B37-13
	Activity 5B47-13
	Strategy 5C: Operate Groundwater Basins Conjunctively7-14
	Activity 5C17-15
	Activity 5C27-15
	Strategy 5D: Investigate Other Groundwater Basins7-15
	Activity 5D17-15
	Activity 5D27-16
	Strategy 5E: Evaluate Other Potential Activities for Increasing Groundwater Use.....7-17
	Activity 5E17-17
	Activity 5E27-17

8	Implementation and Financing	8-1
	Short-Term Activity Costs	8-1
	Implementation Schedule	8-2
	Program Financing	8-3
	Funding of O&M Costs	8-4
	Funding of Capital Costs	8-5
9	Works Cited	9-1

Tables

Number		Page
ES-1	Summary of the SFPUC's Goals, Long-Term Strategies, and Short-Term Activities for Groundwater Management	ES-3
ES-2	Summary of the SFPUC's Goals, Long-Term Strategies, and Short-Term Activities for Groundwater Development and Use	ES-4
ES-3	Projected Annual Capital and O&M Costs for Short-Term Activities	ES-7
1-1	Summary of the SFPUC's Goals, Long-Term Strategies, and Short-Term Activities for Groundwater Management	1-5
1-2	Summary of the SFPUC's Goals, Long-Term Strategies, and Short-Term Activities for Groundwater Development and Use	1-6
1-3	Relationship of Groundwater Management Short-Term Activities to Groundwater Basins	1-7
1-4	Relationship of Groundwater Development and Use Short-Term Activities to Groundwater Basins	1-8
2-1	Estimated Historical and Projected Water Use	2-2
2-2	Summary of Groundwater Resources	2-7
7-1	Potential Activities to Capture Groundwater Lost to the San Francisco Bay or Pacific Ocean in the Northern Portion of the Westside Basin	7-7
7-2	Potential Activities for Capturing Groundwater Produced by Dewatering Operations (Downtown Basin)	7-12
8-1	Summary of Known Short-Term Activity Costs	8-1
8-2	Estimated Cost per Acre-Foot for Short-Term Activities	8-2
8-3	Projected Annual O&M Costs for Short-Term Activities	8-4

Tables
(continued)

Number		Page
8-4	Projected Annual Funding Requirements for Short-Term Activities Using a Pay-As-You-Go Funding Approach	8-5
8-5	Projected Funding Requirements for Short-Term Activities Using a Combined Revenue Bond/Pay-As-You-Go Approach.....	8-6
8-6	Revenue Bond Funded Portion of Short-Term Capital Costs Using a Combined Revenue Bond/Pay-As-You-Go Approach	8-7

Figures

Number		Page
ES-1	Implementation Schedule for Short-Term Groundwater Management Activities.....	ES-5
ES-2	Implementation Schedule for Short-Term Groundwater Development and Use Activities	ES-6
1-1	Groundwater and Recycled Water Programs	1-2
1-2	Integration of Surface Water, Groundwater, and Recycled Water to Meet the Needs of San Francisco Water Customers	1-4
1-3	Groundwater Master Plan Goals	1-9
2-1	Groundwater Basins Within and Adjacent to the City of San Francisco.....	2-1
2-2	Average Daily Water Use by Groundwater Users in the Westside Basin	2-3
2-3	FY 1994 Average Annual City Water Demand (by Groundwater Basin)	2-3
2-4	Major Parks, Golf Courses, and Cemeteries Within and Adjacent to the City of San Francisco	2-4
2-5	Location of Large Potable Water Users	2-5
2-6	Location of Potential Non-Potable Water Users	2-5
2-7	Schematic of the San Francisco Water Supply System	2-6
3-1	GWMP Goal 1: Long-Term Strategies and Short-Term Activities	3-1
3-2a	Groundwater Flow in an Undeveloped Coastal Basin	3-2
3-2b	Onset of Saltwater Intrusion Resulting from Over-Pumping in a Coastal Basin.....	3-2
3-2c	Saltwater Intrusion Resulting from Over-Pumping in a Coastal Basin	3-2
3-3	Generalized Area of the Saltwater Intrusion Model	3-3
3-4a	Water Quality Data from "Warning System" Monitoring Wells Indicate Saltwater Intrusion is Beginning	3-4
3-4b	Injection Wells Activated to Halt Saltwater Intrusion by Pushing Saltwater Oceanward.....	3-4
3-5	Known Sites Where Hazardous or Petroleum Materials Have Been Released to the Environment	3-5

Figures
(Continued)

Number		Page
3-6	Elements of Wellhead Protection Well Permit Approval Process	3-6
3-7	Time-of-Travel Based Wellhead Protection Areas	3-7
3-8	Use of Wellhead Protection Areas to Identify Management Tools	3-7
4-1	GWMP Goal 2: Long-Term Strategies and Short-Term Activities	4-1
4-2	Groundwater Basins and the Overlying Political Entities	4-5
4-3	Groundwater Management Under AB 3030	4-5
5-1	GWMP Goal 3: Long-Term Strategies and Short-Term Activities	5-1
5-2	Location of Major Free-Flowing and Historic Creeks and Lakes.....	5-1
5-3	Changes in the Surface Elevation of Lake Merced	5-2
5-4	Areas Evaluated by City Groundwater Models.....	5-3
5-5a	Lake Merced is an Expression of the Local Groundwater Table Under Non-Pumping Conditions.....	5-4
5-5b	Water Level in Lake Merced is Affected by Local Pumping	5-4
5-6	Changes in the Surface Elevation of Lake Merced Resulting from 5-mgd Recharge	5-5
6-1	GWMP Goal 4: Long-Term Strategies and Short-Term Activities	6-1
6-2	Location of San Francisco Water Supply Facilities Potentially Vulnerable in an Earthquake	6-2
7-1	GWMP Goal 5: Long-Term Strategies and Short-Term Activities	7-2
7-2	Integrated Use of Surface, Recycled, and Groundwater to Meet Water Needs	7-3
7-3	Use of Groundwater for Individual Potable Uses	7-4
7-4	Use of Groundwater in the Local Distribution System	7-4
7-5	Groundwater Recharge in San Francisco	7-5
7-6	Range of Potential Activity Costs in Westside Basin (northern portion)	7-8
7-7	Conceptual Configuration, Activity 5A1	7-9
7-8	Conceptual Configuration, Activity 5A2	7-10

Figures
(Continued)

Number		Page
7-9	High Groundwater Levels in the Downtown Basin	7-11
7-10	Conceptual Approach to Conjunctive Use of San Francisco's Groundwater Basins ...	7-14
8-1	Implementation Schedule for Short-Term Groundwater Management Activities	8-2
8-2	Implementation Schedule for Short-Term Groundwater Development and Use Activities	8-3

Acknowledgments

The San Francisco Public Utilities Commission acknowledges the help of the following companies in preparing this document:

CH2M HILL, INC.
AGS, Inc.
Bookman-Edmonston, Inc.
The Ellington Group
Franklin Dryden
Olivia Chen Consultants
E.M. Rose and Associates
Ken Schmidt Associates
Water Resources Engineering, Inc.

The assistance of the Groundwater Master Plan Steering Committee in providing guidance during development of the plan and review of early drafts of this document also is appreciated greatly. The Steering Committee consists of:

Michael Abramson, City of Daly City
Scott Chad, City of San Bruno
Andrew DeGraca, SF Public Utilities Commission (Water Quality Division)
Frank Filice, SF Department of Public Works (Bureau of Engineering)
Ben Gale, SF Department of Public Health (Bureau of Environmental Health)
Mickey Heo, SF Public Utilities Commission (SPARC Bureau)
Bob Hickman, SF Public Utilities Commission (Operations Engineering)
Karen Kubick, SF Public Utilities Commission (Utilities Engineering Bureau)
Deborah Learner, SF Recreation and Park Department
Norm Lougee, SF Public Utilities Commission (Water Supply and Treatment Division)
Paul Maltzer, SF Planning Department (Office of Environmental Review)
Josh Milstein, SF City Attorney's Office
Chris Morioka, MWD
Joe Pelayo, SF Public Utilities Commission (City Distribution Division)
Steve Phillips, US Geological Survey
Tom Salzano, California Water Service Company
Ken Sato, SF Department of Public Health (Bureau of Environmental Health)
Leonard Swanson, SF Public Utilities Commission (SPARC Bureau)

Acronyms and Abbreviations

AB	Assembly Bill
ac-ft	acre-feet
AWSS	Auxiliary Water Supply System
BART	Bay Area Rapid Transit
BAWUA	Bay Area Water Users Association
Caltrans	California Department of Transportation
CCSF	City and County of San Francisco
CEQA	California Environmental Quality Act
DPW	Department of Public Works
DTSC	Department of Toxic Substances Control
DWR	California Department of Water Resources
EIR	Environmental Impact Report
EOP	Emergency Operations Plan
EPA	Environmental Protection Agency
FY	fiscal year
GIS	Geographical Information System
gpm	gallons per minute
GWMP	Groundwater Master Plan
MCL	maximum contaminant level
mgd	million gallons per day
mg/L	milligrams per liter
MOU	Memorandum of Understanding
NGVD	National Geodetic Vertical Datum of 1929
NPS	National Park Service
O&M	operation and maintenance
RWQCB	Regional Water Quality Control Board
SFPUC	San Francisco Public Utilities Commission
SPARC	System Planning and Regulatory Compliance
USGS	U.S. Geological Survey
WHP	wellhead protection
WPCP	water pollution control plant
WWTP	wastewater treatment plant
yr	year

Glossary

AB3030 - The Groundwater Management Act (1992, California Water Code 10750 et seq) facilitates and encourages local public water agencies to develop and implement groundwater management plans. The legislation identifies 12 elements that may be included in a groundwater management plan. These elements address evaluation or operation of a groundwater basin so that groundwater can be managed to maximize the total water supply while protecting groundwater quality.

Acre-foot (ac-ft) - A quantity or volume of water covering 1 acre to a depth of 1 foot; equal to 43,560 cubic feet or 325,851 gallons.

Aquifer - Saturated rock or sediment that is permeable enough to transmit significant quantities of water to wells and/or springs.

Aquifer Properties - Physical characteristics of an aquifer that influence the movement of groundwater through the aquifer. Aquifer properties include such characteristics as hydraulic conductivity and porosity.

Auxiliary Water Supply System (AWSS) - A separate high-pressure distribution system in the City of San Francisco that provides nonpotable water for firefighting.

Confining Layer - A layer or zone of generally low permeability sediments, such as clay, that underlie or overlie more permeable aquifer material, such as sand and

gravel. A low-permeability layer retards the vertical movement of groundwater.

Conjunctive Use - The coordinated management of groundwater and surface water supplies to increase the availability of water during periods of need. In conjunctive use operations, surface water may be obtained from surplus river flows, imported supplies, recycled water, and desalinated water. Recharge of a groundwater basin may be by “in lieu” means, whereby surplus surface water is used in place of groundwater, or by direct recharge of the water through spreading basins or injection wells.

Dewatering - The process of actively pumping or removing groundwater from a localized area. Dewatering is carried out during construction in areas of high groundwater or for maintaining dry conditions around a completed below-grade structure that extends below the natural water table in order to prevent water damage to the structure.

Discharge - The volume of water flowing in a stream or through an aquifer past a specific point during a given period of time.

Drought Period - A hydrologic period consisting of 1 or more years during which runoff (or precipitation) is classified by the California Department of Water Resources as “below normal,” “dry,” or “critical.”

Saturated Zone - The zone below the water table where most of the pore spaces are occupied by water.

Short-Term Activity (as applied to the Groundwater Master Plan) - A specific action to be taken or study to be conducted during the next 5 years to begin to manage, develop, and use the City's groundwater.

Surface Water - Water on the ground surface such as streams, lakes, and reservoirs.

Time-of-Travel - A specified length of time for groundwater to travel to an active production well. It is dependent upon the aquifer properties (such as hydraulic conductivity) and the rate of pumping in the well.

Title 22, California Code of Regulations - Regulations implementing the Porter Cologne Water Quality Act (California) for water reclamation and the State Safe Drinking Water Act for drinking water. Sets treatment requirements for reclaimed water based on proposed use, and sets primary and secondary standards for drinking water quality. Standards set to protect the public health and welfare.

Unsaturated Zone - The zone between the land surface and the water table where the majority of the pore spaces are occupied by air.

Water Table - The groundwater surface in an unconfined aquifer; the interface between saturated and unsaturated soil when no low-permeability soil layers are present.

Wellhead Protection Area (WHP Area) - The area delineated around a wellhead (or production well) to be protected from possible sources or causes of groundwater contamination.

Executive Summary

The San Francisco Public Utilities Commission (SFPUC) is responsible for providing a reliable, high quality, and affordable water supply for the City and County of San Francisco (CCSF) and its suburban wholesale customers. Surface water supplies from both the Hetch Hetchy Reservoir and local sources have provided most of the City's water supply for the past 60 years. Currently, the City is seeking methods to increase the reliability and security of its long-term water supply. By integrating the use of its potable surface water, potable and nonpotable groundwater, and nonpotable recycled water supplies, the City will continue to manage its water resources effectively.

The development of an integrated approach will respond to the water resource issues facing the City of San Francisco. Several of these issues are common to both the groundwater and recycled water programs being conducted by the SFPUC, including:

- **Bay Delta Hearings.** In the implementation of the new Bay Delta Water Quality Control Plan, the water needs of all urban and agricultural diverters from the Sacramento/San Joaquin River system are being evaluated and San Francisco, as well as other users, may need to give up some water supplies for environmental protection.
- **Water Supply Planning.** Recent studies conducted by the City have indicated that the safe yield of the

Hetch Hetchy system has dropped from 300 mgd to 242 mgd. This has prompted the SFPUC to look for alternative supplies to meet future water demands.

- **Drought Conditions.** Historically, California has experienced many multi-year droughts. During the 1986-92 drought, reservoir supplies became dangerously low and groundwater was overdrafted. Water conservation was necessary for all businesses in the service area and mandatory rationing programs were implemented in San Francisco. Statewide, conjunctive use management of water resources was widely and successfully employed, integrating groundwater and surface water supplies to meet water storage, transport, and quality requirements. Using the City's groundwater resources more effectively and efficiently would produce more water in the long term, and protect against overdraft and degradation in the short term. Conjunctive use of groundwater, surface water, and recycled water will utilize these resources to the maximum extent possible.

This Groundwater Master Plan (Master Plan) summarizes the SFPUC's plans to evaluate, manage, and develop its groundwater resources and to integrate the potable and nonpotable use of groundwater for the benefit of its customers. The Master Plan identifies specific actions to be conducted by the SFPUC during the next 5 years and outlines broader strategies for the next 20 years.

Total water demand in the City is expected to increase over the next 20 years as new higher-density buildings replace those destroyed by the 1989 Loma Prieta earthquake, as idle former military bases begin operating under new uses, as the public relaxes the stringent water-saving practices implemented during the recent drought, and as former industrial areas are revitalized. In 1994, approximately 5 percent of the City's average daily water demand was supplied by groundwater for nonpotable uses. The SFPUC believes it may be possible to increase this percentage to help meet the City's growing water demands

The City's use of groundwater will be increased by implementing a careful and planned approach. Five goals have been identified by the SFPUC to frame its approach to managing, developing, and using the City's groundwater. These goals are as follows:

Goal 1: Protect and Enhance Groundwater Quality

Goal 2: Coordinate Groundwater Use

Goal 3: Protect and Conserve Related Water Resources

Goal 4: Improve Ability to Deliver Water During Emergencies

Goal 5: Maximize Groundwater Use

Goals 1, 2, and 3 focus on groundwater basin **management**. Solid groundwater management practices will provide the building blocks the SFPUC needs to implement Goals 4 and 5, **development and use**. To formulate an overall approach to meet these five goals, the SFPUC has identified long-term strategies to be

implemented by conducting short-term activities. Strategies and activities for each goal are summarized in Tables ES-1 and ES-2.

Long-term strategies are those management practices and techniques the SFPUC will use to meet the goals of its groundwater program. With the SFPUC as the lead agency in managing the City's groundwater, short-term activities will be conducted over the next 5 years to manage, develop, and use the City's groundwater resources. San Francisco fully intends to develop comprehensive groundwater management programs to meet the water resources needs and obligations of the 21st century. The lessons learned and the success of the City's efforts will set an example that will encourage its wholesale customers to implement similar programs. These activities include, but are not limited to, the following:

- Form interjurisdictional committees to manage a common groundwater resource
- Form a Groundwater Management Unit within the SFPUC to be a technical resource for information about the City's groundwater and to implement the City's groundwater program
- Develop and implement a groundwater monitoring program to protect and manage groundwater quality
- Continue and improve monitoring the potential for saltwater intrusion because of increased groundwater use
- Develop a wellhead protection program to protect the quality of groundwater within the City's basins

Table ES-1
 Summary of the SFPUC's Goals,
 Long-Term Strategies, and Short-Term Activities for
GROUNDWATER MANAGEMENT

Goal	Long-Term Strategy	Short-Term Activity
1. Protect and Enhance Groundwater Quality	1A Prevent saltwater intrusion	1A1 Evaluate potential for saltwater intrusion 1A2 Develop and implement a saltwater intrusion prevention network
	1B Reduce risk of future groundwater contamination	1B1 Develop and implement a wellhead protection program
	1C Increase hydrologic data regarding City's groundwater resource	1C1 Develop and implement a groundwater monitoring program
2. Coordinate Groundwater Use	2A Establish SFPUC as lead in City groundwater management	2A1 Establish a Groundwater Management Unit within the SFPUC
	2B Improve coordination with other government agencies regulating/affecting groundwater use within the City	2B1 Form a City groundwater management committee
	2C Improve coordination with adjacent entities whose groundwater use affects shared groundwater basins	2C1 Form appropriate AB 3030 management committee(s)
	2D Enhance communication with City water customers	2D1 Develop and implement a public information program
3. Protect and Conserve Related Water Resources	3A Manage lake water levels	3A1 Conduct additional field investigation at Lake Merced 3A2 Conduct modeling to estimate effects of specific groundwater pumping patterns on Lake Merced water levels 3A3 Evaluate relationship between other City lakes and groundwater 3A4 Develop and implement policies and procedures to manage water levels in City lakes
	3B Manage stream water levels	3B1 Assess effects of groundwater development on Lobos Creek 3B2 Evaluate relationship between other City streams and groundwater 3B3 Develop and implement procedures to manage water levels in City streams

Table ES-2
 Summary of the SFPUC's Goals,
 Long-Term Strategies, and Short-Term Activities for
GROUNDWATER DEVELOPMENT AND USE

Goal	Long-Term Strategy	Short-Term Activity
4. Improve Ability to Deliver Water During Emergencies	4A Evaluate use of groundwater as an emergency reserve	4A1 Study the feasibility of installing large-capacity standby wells 4A2 Design, install and operate large-capacity standby wells, if appropriate 4A3 Update the SFPUC's Emergency Operations Plan
5. Maximize Groundwater Use	5A Capture groundwater outflow to the San Francisco Bay or Pacific Ocean	5A1 Extract groundwater from Elk Glen Well; add to main distribution system 5A2 Extract groundwater from the Sunset District, add to main distribution system
	5B Capture groundwater produced by dewatering operations	5B1 Add groundwater to the AWSS from dewatering at the Powell Street BART 5B2 Identify permanent dewatering operation in the City and identify potential beneficial uses for the water 5B3 Develop procedures to put temporary construction dewatering water to beneficial use 5B4 Evaluate the feasibility of using, and implement if appropriate, the existing sludge line to convey non-potable water to the North Point plant
	5C Operate groundwater basins conjunctively	5C1 Conduct in-lieu recharge of the southern portion of the Westside Basin 5C2 Conduct conjunctive use in the Lobos Basin
	5D Investigate other groundwater basins	5D1 Develop and implement a study of the Lobos Basin 5D2 Develop and implement studies of other shared and City basins
	5E Evaluate other potential activities for increasing groundwater use	5E1 Evaluate, and implement where feasible, potential groundwater use in the City's fountains and decorative pools 5E2 Evaluate, and implement where feasible, the potential for groundwater to help control corrosion in the City's water distribution system

- Collect and analyze additional hydrogeologic information at Lake Merced, evaluate alternative groundwater management practices, and implement the selected alternative(s) to help restore Lake Merced water levels
- Identify potential conjunctive use opportunities to use the local groundwater basins to store surplus surface

water or to retain existing groundwater for use during times of need

- Evaluate the interaction of existing surface water bodies and groundwater to assess potential impacts from increased groundwater use

- Identify the potential development of groundwater resources within the City's groundwater basins to evaluate the potential quantity and quality of groundwater available to the City
- Identify potential uses for groundwater, including emergency supply, potable supply, and nonpotable supply to develop efficient and beneficial management of the City's water resources
- Retrofit or install wells from which groundwater could be pumped and supplied to City customers

An initial screening based on preliminary evaluations of water quality, supply potential, and current groundwater use was done to determine which groundwater basins have the highest potential for groundwater development. Some policies and procedures, such as wellhead protection, will apply to all seven basins, but further evaluations of the other four basins will be done in another phase of this Master Plan.

The SFPUC will implement management activities and short-term development and use activities in a coordinated manner during the next several years. Figures ES-1 and ES-2 show the proposed schedule for implementing the short-term activities.




Figure ES-1
Implementation Schedule for Short-Term
Groundwater Management Activities




Figure ES-2
Implementation Schedule for Short-Term Groundwater
Development and Use Activities

As stated previously, the activities described in this Master Plan will be implemented on a 5-year schedule with the strategies and goals providing the conceptual framework for the City's groundwater management, development, and use over the next 20 years. In addition, activities conducted during implementation of this Master Plan will provide guidance for specific activities to be identified and conducted in the future. Future activities will be evaluated by the public and reviewed for potential environmental

impacts following procedures similar to those used for this Master Plan.

The total cost of funding each of the short-term activities for the next 5 years is estimated to be \$8.07 million (assuming 1997 dollars in year 1 and a 4 percent inflation factor during each of the subsequent 4 years). This includes capital costs of \$5.46 million and \$2.61 million of total annual operation and maintenance (O&M) costs at full implementation of this Master Plan (in year 5). Table ES-3

Table ES-3 Projected Annual Capital and O&M Costs for Short-Term Activities										
	Short-Term Implementation Period									
	Year 1		Year 2		Year 3		Year 4		Year 5	
	Capital Costs	O&M Costs	Capital Costs	O&M Costs	Capital Costs	O&M Costs	Capital Costs	O&M Costs	Capital Costs	O&M Costs
Management Activities										
Goal 1	\$1,125,000	\$0	\$59,100	\$175,000	\$33,000	\$182,000	\$0	\$189,000	\$0	\$197,000
Goal 2	\$45,000	\$0	\$39,000	\$0	\$23,000	\$262,000	\$0	\$273,000	\$0	\$283,000
Goal 3	\$316,000	\$0	\$112,000	\$0	\$12,000	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
Development and Use Projects										
Goal 4	\$14,000	\$0	\$22,000	\$0	\$318,000	\$0	\$318,000	\$304,000	\$318,000	\$316,000
Goal 5	\$317,000	\$0	\$152,000	\$0	\$281,000	\$0	\$1,491,000	\$0	\$460,000	\$429,000
Annual Capital Costs	\$1,817,000		\$384,000		\$667,000		\$1,809,000		\$778,000	
Annual O&M Costs		\$0		\$175,000		\$444,000		\$766,000		\$1,225,000
Annual Costs	\$1,817,000		\$559,000		\$1,111,000		\$2,575,000		\$2,003,000	
Notes:										
1) It is assumed that the City will use revenue bonds to finance all individual projects over \$2.5 million. Therefore, the annual debt service payments are included here for projects 4A1 and 5A2, which assume that issuance costs and reserve requirements will add 15 percent to the principal on these bonds										
2) It is assumed that the City will fund all O&M costs of short-term activities from annual operating budgets.										
3) Costs include inflation, which is assumed to be 4 percent per year.										

summarizes the annual capital costs and O&M costs projected for each of the five Master Plan goals. Actual costs may vary, however, pending final City review, approval, and funding.

The groundwater program will be financed with the SFPUC's routine capital improvement fund and revenue

bonds. The cost of groundwater produced by the currently identified activities that generate water ranges from \$206 to \$526 per acre-foot. These costs compare favorably with the surface water supply cost of \$525 per acre-foot and support the City's commitment to providing reliable, affordable, and high quality water for its customers.

Section One - Introduction

The San Francisco Public Utilities Commission (SFPUC) is responsible for providing a reliable, high-quality, and affordable water supply for the City of San Francisco. Surface water supplies from both the Hetch Hetchy Reservoir and local sources have been able to meet the City's water supply needs for the past 60 years. However, during the 1987-1992 drought, the City faced considerable water shortage impacts due to limitations in the system. To reduce future water shortage impacts, the SFPUC is seeking methods to increase the reliability of its long-term supply. By integrating the use of its surface water, groundwater, and recycled water and continuing its conservation efforts, the City will continue to manage its water resources effectively.

Groundwater was an important component of the City of San Francisco's (the City) water supply during the City's development. The water used by early City residents was primarily obtained from lakes and flowing springs. As its water needs grew, the City became increasingly dependent on local surface water and groundwater. By 1913, the City of San Francisco estimated that it was using approximately 8.5 million gallons of groundwater per day (Bartell, 1913) from private and City wells, springs, and Lobos Creek (which is fed by groundwater). This amount constituted approximately 13 percent of the City's total water use (Freeman, 1912). After completion of the Hetch Hetchy Reservoir in 1934, the use of groundwater within the City decreased.

Since the early 1900s, the City has undergone major changes: it has become a dense urban center with a population exceeding 700,000, it has acquired rights to surface water from outside its limits, and it now owns and operates the citywide water distribution system. In addition, the federal government has promulgated water quality standards to reduce the threat to the public from water-borne diseases. These changes have influenced groundwater use in the City, estimated from available records to be approximately 4 million gallons per day (mgd) in 1994 (not including dewatering operations) or about 5 percent of total potable demand. Most of this groundwater is produced and used by two entities, the San Francisco Recreation and Park Department and the Presidio (operated by the National Park Service [NPS] since 1994; prior to which it was operated by the U.S. Army).

Board of Supervisors Ordinances

In 1991, the City's Board of Supervisors passed Article 22, the Recycled Water Use Ordinance (Ordinances 390-91 and 391-91). This ordinance mandated the development of groundwater and recycled water for maximum beneficial use wherever reasonable. A number of events were driving forces behind the ordinance, including the fifth year of a 6-year drought in Northern California. The ordinance followed several earlier resolutions (389-89, 612-91) that recommended expanded use of groundwater and surface water.

In accordance with the requirement to develop recycled water and groundwater, the Recycled Water Use Ordinance mandated the following actions:

- Prepare a Groundwater Master Plan detailing groundwater development.
- Prepare a Recycled Water Master Plan detailing recycled water development
- Coordinate these plans to help expand the use of groundwater and recycled water by all water consumers in San Francisco

To meet the Board of Supervisor's requirements, the San Francisco Water Department prepared this Groundwater Master Plan. Concurrently, the Recycled Water Master Plan was developed by the Department of Public Works.

Restructuring of City staff in August 1996 resulted in both projects coming under jurisdiction of the PUC. The PUC will be responsible for implementing both plans.

As shown in Figure 1-1, the final Groundwater and Recycled Water Master Plans have moved forward together through environmental review, during 1995-1997. This environmental impact report (EIR), takes place on two levels: (1) the programmatic level, which is global and policy-oriented; and (2) the project level, which is activity-specific. As part of the programmatic EIR, project-specific EIRs will be conducted as required. Additionally, short-term activities identified during implementation of the Master Plans may or may not require project EIRs. After completion of the programmatic EIR, the coordinated implementation of the




Figure 1-1
Groundwater and Recycled Water Programs

groundwater and recycled water programs will be overseen by the SFPUC.

Groundwater Master Plan Overview

This Groundwater Master Plan (Master Plan) summarizes the SFPUC's plans to evaluate, manage, and develop its groundwater resources and to integrate the use of groundwater for the benefit of City water customers (Figure 1-2). It identifies specific activities for the SFPUC to conduct during the next 5 years and outlines broader strategies for the next 20 years. The flexible schedule for conducting the proposed actions can be modified if the needs of the SFPUC change or findings of the planned activities warrant.

Incorporating groundwater into the City's overall water management strategy is a complex undertaking for the following reasons:

- The hydrogeologic complexity and diversity of the City's groundwater basins may prevent uniform application of approaches to groundwater management and use throughout the City.
- In some areas hydrogeologic information is not sufficient for evaluating local groundwater resources.
- Several of the basins are shared with other political entities, necessitating additional coordination and planning.

- Environmental concerns, such as induced saltwater intrusion and impacts on local lakes and groundwater levels, may be associated with increased groundwater use.
- Several areas within the City are known to have poor groundwater quality; the extent of such groundwater and its potential impacts on water uses must be assessed.
- The City plans to increase its use of recycled water within the next 10 years. Increased groundwater use will be coordinated with the use of recycled and surface water.

The Master Plan is intentionally broad in scope to address this wide range of issues and to provide flexibility to the City in meeting its variable water supply and water demands. The Master Plan identified the goals, long-term strategies, and short-term activities developed by the SFPUC to incorporate groundwater into the City's overall water management strategy. The SFPUC defines goals, long-term strategies, and short-term activities as follows:

Goals: The SFPUC's ultimate purpose in managing, developing, and using local groundwater.

Long-Term Strategies: Management practices and techniques to guide activities to be implemented over the next 20 years toward meeting those goals.

Short-Term Activities: Specific activities to be conducted within the next 5 years to begin management, development, and use of groundwater. These include both constructible projects and program development, as well as additional studies to define subsequent activities.




Figure 1-2
 Integration of Surface Water, Groundwater,
 and Recycled Water to Meet the Needs of
 San Francisco Water Customers

Tables 1-1 and 1-2 identify the goals, long-term strategies, and short-term activities developed by the SFPUC. These tables also show which short-term activity is related to which long-term strategy, and subsequently to which goal. However, the goals, strategies, and activities of this

Master Plan are inter-related—information and results from one activity may be used to complete other activities—and will be implemented to maximize this relationship.

Table 1-1
Summary of the SFPUC's Goals,
Long-Term Strategies, and Short-Term Activities for
GROUNDWATER MANAGEMENT

Goal	Long-Term Strategy	Short-Term Activity
1. Protect and Enhance Groundwater Quality	1A Prevent saltwater intrusion	1A1 Evaluate potential for saltwater intrusion 1A2 Develop and implement a saltwater intrusion prevention network
	1B Reduce risk of future groundwater contamination	1B1 Develop and implement a wellhead protection program
	1C Increase hydrologic data regarding City's groundwater resource	1C1 Develop and implement a groundwater monitoring program
2. Coordinate Groundwater Use	2A Establish SFPUC as lead in City groundwater management	2A1 Establish a Groundwater Management Unit within the SFPUC
	2B Improve coordination with other government agencies regulating/affecting groundwater use within the City	2B1 Form a City groundwater management committee
	2C Improve coordination with adjacent entities whose groundwater use affects shared groundwater basins	2C1 Form appropriate AB 3030 management committee(s)
	2D Enhance communication with City water customers	2D1 Develop and implement a public information program
3. Protect and Conserve Related Water Resources	3A Manage lake water levels	3A1 Conduct additional field investigation at Lake Merced
		3A2 Conduct modeling to estimate effects of specific groundwater pumping patterns on Lake Merced water levels
		3A3 Evaluate relationship between other City lakes and groundwater
		3A4 Develop and implement policies and procedures to manage water levels in City lakes
	3B Manage stream water levels	3B1 Assess effects of groundwater development on Lobos Creek
		3B2 Evaluate relationship between other City streams and groundwater
		3B3 Develop and implement procedures to manage water levels in City streams

Table 1-2
Summary of the SFPUC's Goals,
Long-Term Strategies, and Short-Term Activities for
GROUNDWATER DEVELOPMENT AND USE

Goal	Long-Term Strategy	Short-Term Activity
4. Improve Ability to Deliver Water During Emergencies	4A Evaluate use of groundwater as an emergency reserve	4A1 Study the feasibility of installing large-capacity standby wells 4A2 Design, install and operate large-capacity standby wells, if appropriate 4A3 Update the SFPUC's Emergency Operations Plan
5. Maximize Groundwater Use	5A Capture groundwater outflow to the San Francisco Bay or Pacific Ocean 5B Capture groundwater produced by dewatering operations 5C Operate groundwater basins conjunctively 5D Investigate other groundwater basins 5E Evaluate other potential activities for increasing groundwater use	5A1 Extract groundwater from Elk Glen Well; add to main distribution system 5A2 Extract groundwater from the Sunset District, add to main distribution system 5B1 Add groundwater to the AWSS from dewatering at the Powell Street BART 5B2 Identify permanent dewatering operation in the City and identify potential beneficial uses for the water 5B3 Develop procedures to put temporary construction dewatering water to beneficial use 5B4 Evaluate the feasibility of using, and implement if appropriate, the existing sludge line to convey non-potable water to the North Point plant 5C1 Conduct in-lieu recharge of the southern portion of the Westside Basin 5C2 Conduct conjunctive use in the Lobos Basin 5D1 Develop and implement a study of the Lobos Basin 5D2 Develop and implement studies of other shared and City basins 5E1 Evaluate, and implement where feasible, potential groundwater use in the City's fountains and decorative pools 5E2 Evaluate, and implement where feasible, the potential for groundwater to help control corrosion in the City's water distribution system

Tables 1-3 and 1-4 provide summaries of the short-term activities applicable to each groundwater basin within the City.

The goals, strategies, and activities are discussed below and in detail in Sections 3 through 8 of this Master Plan.

Table 1-3
*Relationship of Groundwater Management
Short-Term Activities to Groundwater Basins*

Short-Term Activities	Groundwater Basin							
	Downtown	Islais Valley	Lobos	Marina	South	Visitation Valley	Northern Portion of Westside	Southern Portion of Westside
1A1 Evaluate potential for saltwater intrusion			●				●	
1A2 Develop and implement saltwater intrusion prevention network							●	
1B1 Develop and implement a wellhead protection program	●	●	●	●	●	●	●	
1C1 Develop and implement groundwater monitoring program	●	●	●	●	●	●	●	
2A1 Establish a Groundwater Management Unit within the SFPUC	●	●	●	●	●	●	●	
2B1 Form a City groundwater management committee	●	●	●	●	●	●	●	
2C1 Form appropriate AB 3030 management committee(s)		●	●	●		●	●	●
2D1 Develop and implement a public information program	●	●	●	●	●	●	●	
3A1 Conduct additional field investigation at Lake Merced							●	●
3A2 Conduct modeling to estimate effects of specific groundwater pumping patterns on Lake Merced water levels							●	●
3A3 Evaluate relationship between other City lakes and groundwater			●				●	
3A4 Develop and implement policies and procedures to manage water levels in City lakes			●				●	●
3B1 Assess effects of groundwater development on Lobos Creek			●					
3B2 Evaluate relationship between other City streams and groundwater	●	●	●	●			●	
3B3 Develop and implement procedures to manage water levels in City streams	●	●	●	●			●	

Table 1-4
Relationship of Groundwater
Development and Use Short-Term
Activities to Groundwater Basins

Short-Term Activities	Groundwater Basin							
	Downtown	Islais Valley	Lobos	Marina	South	Visitation Valley	Northern Portion of Westside	Southern Portion of Westside
4A1 Study the feasibility of installing large-capacity standby wells	●	●	●	●	●	●	●	
4A2 Design, install, and operate large-capacity standby wells, if appropriate	●	●	●	●	●	●	●	
4A3 Update the SFPUC's Emergency Operations Plan	●	●	●	●	●	●	●	
5A1 Extract groundwater from Elk Glen Well; add to main distribution system							●	
5A2 Extract groundwater from the Sunset District, add to main distribution system							●	
5B1 Add groundwater to the AWSS from dewatering at the Powell Street BART	●							
5B2 Identify permanent dewatering operation in the City and identify potential beneficial uses of the water	●	●	●	●	●	●	●	
5B3 Develop procedures to put temporary construction dewatering water to beneficial use	●	●	●	●	●	●	●	
5B4 Evaluate the feasibility of using, and implement if appropriate, the existing sludge line to convey non-potable water to the North Point plant	●							
5C1 Conduct in-lieu recharge of the southern portion of the Westside Basin								●
5C2 Conduct conjunctive use in the Lobos Basin			●					
5D1 Develop and implement a study of the Lobos Basin			●					
5D2 Develop and implement studies of other shared and City basins		●		●	●	●		
5E1 Evaluate, and implement where feasible, potential groundwater use in the City's fountains and decorative pools	●	●	●	●	●	●	●	
5E2 Evaluate, and implement where feasible, the potential for groundwater to help control corrosion in the City's water distribution system	●	●	●	●	●	●	●	

Goals

Groundwater in the groundwater basins must be protected and carefully managed to be effective as a long-term resource. To emphasize the importance of this management, the SFPUC has established three groundwater management goals:

- **Goal 1:** Protect and Enhance Groundwater Quality
- **Goal 2:** Coordinate Groundwater Use
- **Goal 3:** Protect and Conserve Related Water Resources

Once a framework for long-term management of the groundwater basins has been established, the SFPUC anticipates that groundwater can be strategically developed and used. Therefore, the SFPUC has two development and use goals:

- **Goal 4:** Improve Ability to Deliver Water During Emergencies
- **Goal 5:** Maximize Groundwater Use

Implementation of these SFPUC goals will be coordinated to achieve successful implementation of the Master Plan (Figure 1-3).

Long-Term Strategies

Long-term strategies, which have a time frame of up to 20 years, are broad in scope to allow for flexibility so they can be updated as new information becomes available. In some cases, additional short-term activities will be needed to achieve the long-term strategy. Long-term strategies

GROUNDWATER MANAGEMENT GOALS

- Protect and Enhance Groundwater Quality
- Coordinate Groundwater Use
- Protect and Conserve Related Water Resources

GROUNDWATER DEVELOPMENT AND USE GOALS

- Improve Ability to Deliver Water During Emergencies
- Maximize Groundwater Use

**Successful
Implementation
of Groundwater
Master Plan**

Figure 1-3
Groundwater Master Plan Goals

are relatively specific for the Westside and Downtown Basins and are more general for the other basins where there are insufficient data to support more specific strategies.

Short-Term Activities

Short-term activities will be conducted or initiated by the SFPUC within the next 5 years to move toward managing, developing, and using City groundwater within the framework of the goals and strategies outlined above. Short-term activities include constructible projects (such as the Sunset District wells), development of programs (wellhead protection program), and identification of additional studies (Lobos Basin). Additional studies are recommended in some situations to provide the City sufficient information for its decisions regarding groundwater management, development, and use.

Groundwater Master Plan Organization


The remainder of this document is organized as follows:

- Section 2:*** Background information on the City's water resources
- Sections 3-7:*** Discussions of the goals, long-term strategies, and short-term activities that constitute the City's groundwater program
- Section 8:*** Summary of capital and operation and maintenance costs, and the likely implementation schedule and funding sources for the short-term activities

Section Two - San Francisco Water Resources

Seven groundwater basins occur beneath the City of San Francisco: the Westside, Lobos, Marina, Downtown, Islais Valley, South, and Visitacion Valley Basins (Figure 2-1). Designation of the groundwater basins within the Master Plan follows the U.S. Geological Survey (USGS) description of "a contiguous body of unconsolidated sediments and the surrounding surface drainage area" (Phillips et al., 1993). The Lobos, Marina, Downtown, and South Basins are contained wholly within the limits of the City (City boundaries are shown in Figure 4-2). The Islais Valley Basin extends beneath Daly City, Visitacion Valley Basin extends beneath the City of Brisbane, and the Westside Basin extends south of the City across several political boundaries (the Cities of Daly City, Colma, South San Francisco, San Bruno, and Millbrae) past the San Francisco International Airport. Groundwater demands within the Westside Basin vary; thus, the Master Plan references the northern portion of the Westside Basin (north of the City boundary) and the southern portion of the Westside Basin (south of the City boundary) to help distinguish between the groundwater beneath the City and County of San Francisco and the groundwater that is physically connected to, but located beneath land outside the City limits.

Section 2 summarizes the City's water supply and demand, existing water supply systems, and groundwater resources.



Parks (see Fig. 2-4 for names) Bedrock Exposure

SOURCE for bedrock areas: Phillips et al., 1993

Figure 2-1
Groundwater Basins Within and
Adjacent to the City of San Francisco

Historical, Current, and Projected Future Water Supply and Demand

Historical and projected future water supply and demand for both the City and the area south of the City appear in Table 2-1. Changes in water use in the Westside Basin from 1970 to 1994 by users of both groundwater and surface water supplies are shown in Figure 2-2.

**Table 2-1
Estimated Historical and Projected Water Use
(average day in mgd)**

Groundwater Basin	FY 1970 ^{a,b,c}			FY 1980 ^{a,b,c}			FY 1990 ^{a,b,c}			FY 1994 ^{a,b,c,d}			2000 ^{e,f}	2010 ^{e,f}
	Surface Water	Ground- water ^g	Total	Surface Water	Ground- water ^g	Total	Surface Water	Ground water ^g	Total	Surface Water	Ground water ^g	Total	Total	Total
Westside (northern portion)	19.8	2	21.8	15.5	2	17.5	13.8	2	15.8	13.1	2	15.1	--	--
Lobos	6.5	2	8.5	5.1	2	7.1	4.5	2	6.5	4.4	2	6.4	--	--
Marina	8.3	0	8.3	6.5	0	6.5	5.8	0	5.8	5.1	0	5.1	--	--
Downtown	53.7	0	53.7	42.1	0	42.1	37.2	0	37.2	34.9	0	34.9	--	--
Islais Valley	15.7	0	15.7	12.3	0	12.3	10.9	0	10.9	10.2	0	10.2	--	--
South	5.4	0	5.4	4.2	0	4.2	3.7	0	3.7	3.6	0	3.6	--	--
Visitation Valley	1.9	0	1.9	1.5	0	1.5	1.3	0	1.3	1.5	0	1.5	--	--
Total City	111.3	4	115.3	87.2	4	91.2	77.1	4	81.2	72.8	4	76.8	76.5	77.5
Westside (southern portion) ^h	15.9	7.3	23.2	14.1	6.6	20.7	13.5	5.4	18.9	13.8	6.8	20.6	25.1	25.1
Total All Basins	127.2	11.3	138.5	101.3	10.6	111.9	90.6	9.4	100.0	86.6	10.6	97.4	101.6	102.6

^aEstimates are for City fiscal year (FY) that runs from July 1 to June 30.

^bSources of in-City estimates are Bookman-Edmonston Engineering (1992), SFWD City Distribution Division, and Pitometer Associates (1961-1989).

^cSource of outside-City estimates are Bay Area Water Users Association, Cities of San Bruno and Daly City, California Water Service, and SFWD.

^d1994 demand numbers reflect the results of mandatory conservation required by City Ordinances 185-91, 346-91, and 359-91.

^eSource of in-City estimates is the Urban Water Management Plan for the City and County of San Francisco, 1996.

^fEstimates include groundwater use projected to be the same as FY 1994, including 2-mgd demand met by NPS' diversion from Lobos Creek.

^gOnly known active wells producing a significant amount of groundwater are included as groundwater demand. Dewatering operations are not included.

^hIncludes water suppliers with both groundwater and surface water supplies only (Cities of San Bruno and Daly City and California Water Service, South San Francisco) and the San Francisco International Airport.





Figure 2-2
Average Daily Water Use by Groundwater Users in the Westside Basin


On an average day in 1994, an estimated 76.8 mgd of water was used in the City, 72.8 mgd of surface water and 4 mgd of groundwater. This is significantly less than total water use in 1980 (91.2 mgd) and 1970 (115.3 mgd). A number of factors, including decline in industrial water use, the loss of buildings from the 1989 Loma Prieta earthquake, recent military base closures (e.g., Hunters Point), and the 1976-1977 and 1987-1992 droughts, have contributed to the recent decline in water demand (and hence, supply). As projected by the SFPUC (City and County of San Francisco, 1996), the average day demand is expected to remain consistent with current demands. As shown in Table 2-1, 1994 City water demand is highest in the northern portion of the Westside and Downtown Basins. The distribution of City water demand in 1994 by groundwater basin appears in Figure 2-3.



Data are from Water Department Records

Figure 2-3
FY 1994 Average Annual City Water Demand (by Groundwater Basin)

FY1994 total water demand by municipal users of both groundwater and surface water within the southern portion of the Westside Basin (Cities of San Bruno, Daly City, and South San Francisco, supplied by California Water Service) and the San Francisco International Airport was approximately 20.4 mgd (13.8 mgd of surface water and 6.6 mgd of groundwater). In 1991, an additional estimated 3 mgd of nonmunicipal groundwater was used seasonally (a rate that is assumed to be continuing) for irrigation of private golf courses and cemeteries (shown in Figure 2-4).



The 20.4-mgd total water demand (surface and groundwater) in 1994 by groundwater users in the southern portion of the Westside Basin has increased from the 1990 level of 18.9 mgd and is similar to the 20.7-mgd demand in 1980. The decrease in total water demand from 1970 to 1990 can be attributed to the same factors that have affected the City's water demand. Projected future demand in the southern portion of the Westside Basin is expected to increase to 25.1 mgd by 2000.

Location of In-City Water Demand


The most economical way to use groundwater is to serve the largest demand, or combination of demands, with the fewest possible wells pumping at full capacity. City groundwater can be used to meet demands for potable and nonpotable water. As part of the development of the groundwater and recycled water Master Plans, both potential potable water users and nonpotable users, or groups of users, were identified that could be served with groundwater.

Initially, the large potable water users were identified and located. For the purposes of this Master Plan, large potable users (Figure 2-5) are those using more than 10 acre-feet of water per year (the equivalent of approximately 9,000 gallons per day). As Figure 2-5 shows, large water users are concentrated within the downtown commercial area. The SFPUC currently serves most of these large water users with surface water, except for Recreation and Park Department facilities, several golf

courses in the Lake Merced area, the zoo, and the Presidio. These exceptions are, in part, served by groundwater.

In the Recycled Water Master Plan (1997), the SFPUC identified potential nonpotable water users within the City as those using water primarily for irrigation (Figure 2-6).


The largest of these are the large parks and golf courses in the northern portion of the Westside Basin. Smaller potential nonpotable water users include schools, playgrounds, and smaller neighborhood parks throughout the City.



▲ = Major Groundwater User
△ = Major Surface Water User

NOTE: Large users are those users identified from Water Department records who use more than 10 acre-feet (3.26 million gallons) of water per year
Sources: San Francisco Water Department, City Distribution Division, Pitometer Associates (1961-1989)

Figure 2-5
Location of Large Potable Water Users



Parks (see Fig. 2-4 for names)

◆ Users scheduled to be provided with recycled water during Phase 1 of the Recycled Water Master Plan (1995).

▼ Users scheduled to be provided with groundwater during Phase 2 and then recycled water after completion of Phase 3 of the Recycled Water Master Plan (1995).

□ Other potential non-potable water users

Figure 2-6
Location of Potential Non-Potable Water Users

SOURCE City and County of San Francisco, 1992 and 1995

The City's Current Water Supply System

The SFPUC transports surface water from the Tuolumne River watershed (Hetch Hetchy, Lake Lloyd, and Lake Eleanor Reservoirs) in the Sierra Nevada across the San Joaquin Valley into Alameda County. The transmission pipelines for this surface water supply are designed to have the capacity to deliver 300 mgd of water. For planning purposes, however, the SFPUC estimates that the firm delivery yield is 240 mgd, based on estimates of the maximum amount of water the system could produce under worst-case dry periods (City and County of San Francisco, 1994a). From Alameda County, the surface water supply is split, and the SFPUC transmits some of the water south into and through Santa Clara County, and the remainder west into and through San Mateo County, eventually into San Francisco County (Figure 2-7).

Using this surface water supply, the SFPUC serves 33 wholesale customers in Alameda, Santa Clara, and San Mateo Counties, and retail customers in the City. This surface water supply is augmented by local surface water (Calaveras, San Antonio, Crystal Springs, San Andreas, and Pilarcitos Reservoirs), groundwater, and other surface water from sources such as the California Emergency Water Bank.




Figure 2-7
Schematic of the San Francisco Water Supply System

Groundwater Resources

Groundwater in the seven basins beneath the City (including three basins that extend beyond the City boundaries) is a valuable resource that is currently not managed. Based on assumptions of aquifer thickness and size, and on groundwater elevation data collected during the 1987-1992 drought (the only period with adequate groundwater elevation data), some groundwater basins can yield additional groundwater for use by City customers.

As noted in Table 2-2 and throughout this Master Plan, however, the SFPUC must address several technical and institutional issues before producing additional groundwater to supply its customers. To understand how much groundwater could potentially be developed in both the short and the long term, the available relevant data for each basin were assessed. Known information about the groundwater resources of each basin is summarized in Table 2-2 and discussed below.

Table 2-2 Summary of Groundwater Resources					
Basin	Estimated Average Annual Recharge (ac-ft/yr) ^{a,b}	Likely Groundwater Quality ^c	Development Potential (reason)	Amount of Groundwater Extracted from Basin (1993) ^d	
				(ac-ft/yr)	(mgd)
Westside	14,800 ^e	Potable	High (north of Lake Merced, conjunctive use potential)	~13,800	12.3 ^f
Lobos	1,600	Potable	Medium (conjunctive use potential)	2,300 ^g	2
Marina	1,300	Unknown	Low (high subsidence potential)	Unknown	--
Downtown	5,900	Nonpotable	Medium-Low (high water levels, high subsidence potential)	800 - 5,600 ^h	0.7 - 5
Islais Valley	1,800	Unknown	Insufficient data	Unknown	--
South	700	Unknown	Insufficient data	Unknown	--
Visitation Valley	Unknown	Unknown	Insufficient data	Unknown	--

^aRecharge estimates are based on USGS data (Phillips et al., 1993), except for data from the portion of the Westside Basin south of the county line. USGS data were collected for 1987 and 1988, the first years of a 6-year drought. Recharge estimates have been rounded to the nearest 100 acre-feet.

^bRecharge includes leakage from underground pipes, which has not been specifically quantified. It can be assumed that recharge from this source will decrease in the future as repairs to the system are made.

^cPotential sources of groundwater contamination exist in each basin (see Figure 3-5, Section 3). Where groundwater quality conditions are known, a preliminary assessment of the potable or nonpotable water quality is shown.

^dNumbers are estimates based on City and Bay Area Water Users Association records. Estimates may be low because pumping records are incomplete (no requirement for reporting exists).

^eIncludes recharge of both the northern and southern portions of the Westside Basin. Applied Consultants (1991) estimated the average annual recharge to the southern portion of the Westside Basin to be 9,970 ac-ft/yr. Phillips et al. (1993) estimated the average annual recharge to the northern portion of the Westside Basin to be 4,900 ac-ft/yr.

^fExtraction based on Bay Area Water Users Association estimate of 7.3 mgd municipal use and 3 mgd non-municipal use and SFPUC estimate of 2 mgd use.

^gLobos Creek flow (1,800 ac-ft/yr) plus documented groundwater extraction (530 ac-ft/yr). Additional evaluation is necessary to determine whether the recharge and extraction numbers accurately represent Lobos Basin conditions.

^hGroundwater extracted in the Downtown Basin is assumed to be for dewatering. 800 ac-ft/yr are known to be extracted, but the SFPUC estimates that an average of 5,600 ac-ft/yr of dewatering water is added to the sewer system.

Estimated Average Annual Recharge

Table 2-2 lists estimates of the annual average amount of recharge for each basin, i.e., the amount of water entering the basin each year from percolation to the water table of irrigation water or rainfall, or from leakage of underground pipes. As the table indicates, the Westside and Downtown Basins have the highest annual average recharge rate. The recharge values were calculated by the USGS based on data collected during 1987 and 1988, both drought years in northern California.

Development Potential

Table 2-2 also presents the SFPUC's qualitative judgment of the groundwater development potential of each basin based on aquifer thickness, susceptibility to subsidence and saltwater intrusion, and historic groundwater levels. A thick aquifer, such as that found in portions of the Westside Basin, increases the development potential of the basin because of the large volume of groundwater contained within it and the ability to extract groundwater from different intervals within the aquifer. Conversely, subsurface sediments with a high clay content, such as those found in the Downtown and Marina Basins, make an area susceptible to subsidence, and groundwater development requires a high level of planning and coordination.

Likely Groundwater Quality

The SFPUC's qualitative assessment of overall groundwater quality in each basin is included in Table 2-2. This assessment, based on the historic and recent analytical results of groundwater samples collected from a number of

locations within the basin, is a generalization of basinwide groundwater quality. Further analysis will be necessary at each new well site to determine local water quality.

Groundwater in the southern portion of the Westside Basin and Lobos Basin already is used for potable purposes. Potable groundwater suppliers in these basins routinely sample and analyze for compliance with drinking water standards. The groundwater of these basins is, therefore, considered potable.

Groundwater in the northern portion of the Westside Basin is also considered potable based on limited historic data and preliminary sampling results obtained during the winter of 1993 from 10 locations in the basin. These data and available historical data indicate that occasional concentrations of nitrates, chlorides, iron, total dissolved solids, and fecal coliform have been detected above drinking water standards. However, these measurements occur at scattered locations and vary through the period of the record. Collection of additional site-specific water quality data will be necessary before the proposed projects are implemented. Ongoing monitoring will also be necessary for future protection of groundwater quality.

Downtown Basin groundwater is being considered for nonpotable uses only (i.e., toilet flushing, irrigation, and climate control) because of the historic industrial development and the density of identified hazardous waste sites. Analysis of 20 water samples in 1993 from the Downtown Basin showed that 19 of the 20 wells contained water suitable for selected nonpotable municipal and industrial development uses without treatment. Only five of these samples met Title 22 Drinking Water Standards for

bacteriological, general physical, general mineral, and inorganic chemical analyses.

Insufficient data are available for an assessment of groundwater quality in the Marina, Islais Valley, South, and Visitacion Valley Basins.

Amount of Groundwater Extracted from Basin

Table 2-2 also presents the SFPUC's estimate of the approximate total amount of groundwater extracted from each basin during 1993. The difference between the estimated average annual recharge and the extracted amount yields a preliminary estimate of the maximum additional amount of groundwater that could be withdrawn from the basin during an average year under current recharge conditions. Because withdrawing the maximum amount of groundwater could potentially induce undesirable effects (such as saltwater intrusion or subsidence), the SFPUC recognizes that full withdrawal of this amount will not occur.

Evaluation of Groundwater Resources and Water Demand

The Westside and Downtown Basins have the largest basin capacity, the highest estimated average annual recharge, and the highest demands; therefore, they have the greatest potential for groundwater development. By contrast, the Marina Basin's aquifer is thin, with a high potential for subsidence, and the quality of its groundwater is unknown. For these reasons, the Marina Basin has a much smaller

potential for development and, pending additional studies, may be considered for minimal future groundwater development only.

In the South, Visitacion, and Islais Valley Basins, groundwater is generally undeveloped, and information on hydrogeologic properties and water quality is limited. Evaluation of the development potential of groundwater in these basins would require additional data collection and user surveys. Although these basins are not likely candidates for development in the near term, the SFPUC will assess the potential for long-term development after the additional studies have been completed.

Finally, groundwater in the Lobos Basin was developed for use by the U.S. Army at the Presidio Army Base. The Presidio was transferred to the National Park Service (NPS) in September 1994. The SFPUC wants to protect this shared basin for future water production and conjunctive use opportunities. To meet this objective, and the NPS have agreed informally to share relevant Lobos Basin hydrogeologic data as a measure to protect the basin's groundwater and surface water resources.

Section Three - Goal 1: Protect and Enhance Groundwater Quality

The SFPUC has identified the protection and enhancement of groundwater quality as a critical goal in order to protect groundwater as a potential long-term water supply. If groundwater quality deteriorates, wellhead treatment or additional distribution facilities will be needed. Such facilities can be expensive and would increase the cost of groundwater. Groundwater quality can be degraded in many ways, such as through the intrusion of saltwater into a freshwater aquifer or leakage from underground storage tanks or sewers. Degradation of water quality would reduce the basin yield, thereby diminishing production from existing activities and limiting future groundwater development activities.

Three long-term strategies designed to protect and enhance groundwater quality are shown in Figure 3-1. These long-term strategies and the short-term activities associated with them are discussed below.

Strategy 1A: Prevent Saltwater Intrusion

Generalized groundwater flow in an undeveloped coastal area is shown in Figure 3-2a; fresh water from the coastal aquifer occurs above the more dense salt water. The salt water is prevented from migrating landward by the hydraulic head of the fresh water, which must be high enough above sea level to offset the greater density of the salt water. Once over-pumping of the aquifer begins at rates high enough to reduce the freshwater hydraulic head or at rates greater than the natural flow through the aquifer, the denser salt water begins to migrate towards the well, as shown in Figure 3-2b. Eventually, with continued over-pumping of groundwater, the salt water moves far enough inland to be extracted from the well (Figure 3-2c). When salt water is pumped from a well, the may no longer meet acceptable water quality standards, and the value of that groundwater basin decreases. The SFPUC has defined two activities to evaluate and reduce the potential for degradation of water quality.

Figure 3-1
GWMP Goal 1: Long-Term Strategies and Short-Term Activities

Goal	Long-Term Strategy	Short-Term Activity
1. Protect and Enhance Groundwater Quality	1A Prevent saltwater intrusion	1A1 Evaluate potential for saltwater intrusion 1A2 Develop and implement a saltwater intrusion prevention network
	1B Reduce risk of future groundwater contamination	1B1 Develop and implement a wellhead protection program
	1C Increase hydrologic data regarding City's groundwater resource	1C1 Develop and implement a groundwater monitoring program

M A N A G E M E N T




Figure 3-2a
Groundwater Flow in an
Undeveloped Coastal Basin




Figure 3-2b
Onset of Saltwater Intrusion
Resulting from Over-Pumping
in a Coastal Basin




Figure 3-2c
Saltwater Intrusion Resulting
from Over-Pumping in a
Coastal Basin

Activity 1A1: Evaluate Potential for Saltwater Intrusion

The potential for inducing saltwater intrusion into a potable aquifer is a primary concern when developing groundwater in a coastal area such as San Francisco. To avoid creating the situation shown in Figure 3-2c when implementing its goal of increasing groundwater use (Goal 5), the SFPUC has developed a groundwater model using existing available hydrogeologic data.

The Saltwater Intrusion Model is an analytical tool developed to assist the City in evaluating the effects of pumping rate and location on the saltwater-freshwater interface in the portion of the Westside Basin north of Lake Merced (Figure 3-3). This area is considered to have the highest potential for potable groundwater development within the City and County of San Francisco.

The Saltwater Intrusion Model has been used to provide preliminary estimates for evaluating the proposed groundwater development options being considered in the Sunset District: Activities 5A1 (Extract groundwater from Elk Glen Well) and 5A2 (Extract groundwater from the Sunset District), which are discussed in Section 7. The model has been used to evaluate the effects of moving the proposed well locations and varying the quantity of water proposed to be extracted on the saltwater-freshwater interface. It has also been used to identify the area contributing water to the wells under different conditions to assess how much recharge the wells will capture and whether the proposed extraction affects groundwater conditions in the vicinity of Lake Merced.




Figure 3-3
Generalized Area of the Saltwater Intrusion Model

The model will be used by the City during planning and development of the proposed locations to assess how changes in existing groundwater use or recharge conditions affect the potential for additional groundwater development in the area. Additionally, the City will collect water quality and water level data during testing and development of the area to determine whether the model is accurately reproducing groundwater conditions. Model improvements will be made as additional hydrogeologic data are collected.

Activity 1A2: Develop and Implement a Saltwater Intrusion Prevention Network

As the City's near-shore groundwater development begins, the SFPUC plans to develop a saltwater intrusion prevention network. In addition, a groundwater monitoring and contingency plan to prevent saltwater intrusion during operation of the planned wells will be developed.

Concurrent with, or prior to, installation of the proposed production wells identified in Activities 5A1 (Extract groundwater from Elk Glen Well) and 5A2 (Extract groundwater from the Sunset District) (see Section 7), the City will identify monitoring well locations between the estimated present saltwater interface and the proposed production wells. The possibility of using existing wells will be considered as an alternative to the installation of new wells. Before and after operation of the new production wells begins, water levels and water quality indicators (i.e., total dissolved solids and chloride) will be monitored routinely within the monitoring wells. These data will be collected and evaluated to manage groundwater pumping within the basin relative to preventing saltwater intrusion.

If the saltwater interface is moving landward as a result of the pumping at the new production wells (Figure 3-4a), one of two actions can be taken. Either pumping at the production wells can be reduced to levels that will not induce saltwater intrusion, or recharge water can be introduced into the aquifer via injection wells (Figure 3-4b).




Figure 3-4a
Water Quality Data from
"Warning System" Monitoring
Wells Indicate Saltwater
Intrusion is Beginning




Figure 3-4b
Injection Wells Activated to
Halt Saltwater Intrusion by
Pushing Salt Water Oceanward


The groundwater monitoring and contingency plan will address the following issues:

- Monitoring well locations, as necessary
- Injection well locations, as necessary
- Injection water sources (consider recycled water, surface water, and groundwater, depending on the revised regulations for groundwater recharge currently being developed by the state)
- Sampling parameters, procedures, frequency, and schedule
- Action levels for implementation of the contingency plan (i.e., conducting one of the two actions to counter saltwater intrusion)
- Specific actions to be taken to counter saltwater intrusion

Strategy 1B: Reduce Risk of Future Groundwater Contamination

Lists of sites where hazardous or petroleum materials have been found in the soil or groundwater (usually at industrial sites) are maintained by the California Regional Water Quality Control Board (RWQCB), San Francisco Bay Region; the California Environmental Protection Agency (EPA),

Department of Toxic Substances Control (DTSC), Region 2; and the Department of Health Services of the Counties of San Francisco and San Mateo. The distribution of these sites within the City (as of 1995) is shown in Figure 3-5. Although contamination has not been identified in the groundwater at each of the mapped sites, sites with known soil contamination represent a potential threat to present or future groundwater quality.



Parks (see Fig. 2-4 for names)

- Soil Contamination
- ⊗ Groundwater and Unidentified Contamination

SOURCE: Regional Water Quality Control Board, 1994.

Figure 3-5
Known Sites Where Hazardous or Petroleum Materials Have Been Released to the Environment

To prevent degradation of groundwater beneath areas intended or already under development for groundwater use, existing groundwater contamination in these areas should be managed to reduce the risk of future groundwater contamination. Types of groundwater contamination to be considered include those from both point sources (contamination originating from specific locations) and nonpoint sources (contamination originating from multiple or diffuse locations, such as pesticide and herbicide use in landscape areas and gardens). Nonpoint sources within the City have not yet been identified by any state, federal, or City agency.

One short-term activity has been identified to achieve the long-term strategy of reducing the risk of groundwater contamination.

Activity 1B1: Develop and Implement a Wellhead Protection Program

The objective of a wellhead protection program is to locate potential sources of groundwater contamination within a specified protection area and to reduce the risk of these potential sources affecting groundwater quality.

One component of a wellhead protection program is an approach to well permitting (Figure 3-6) designed to minimize potential groundwater contamination. The permit requirements should be revised to include a complete plan describing well construction details, a delineation of wellhead protection areas (Figure 3-7), an analysis of the proximity of the proposed new well to potential contamination sources (Figure 3-8), an analysis

of potential contaminant travel time, a proposed groundwater quality sampling program, and an analysis of potential effects of the proposed new well on saltwater intrusion and other environmental considerations.




Figure 3-6
Elements of Wellhead Protection Well Permit Approval Process




Figure 3-7
Time-of-Travel Based
Wellhead Protection Areas

The San Francisco Department of Public Health currently administers the City's well permitting program. Permits are required for construction, operation, and abandonment of all wells in the City and for drilling soil borings. Section 4 describes the way the proposed Groundwater Management Unit of the SFPUC will work with the San Francisco Department of Public Health to use the existing well permitting system in managing the City's groundwater basins as a long-term resource. Under a program focused on protecting water quality, well permit applications that pose a risk to the long-term resource will be denied.

The SFPUC's wellhead protection program would include the following components:

- Delineate "wellhead protection areas"
- Develop a management program to protect the water supply from contaminants within a "wellhead protection area"
- Identify potential contamination sources, including known industrial contamination sites, present and historic sites where activities potentially affecting water quality may have occurred, and nonpoint sources




Figure 3-8
Use of Wellhead Protection Areas
to Identify Management Tools
(Potential pollution source inventory is shown)

- Install well meters and require reporting of water use
- Develop contingency plans to respond to emergencies within the wellhead protection areas
- Facilitate public participation in the development and implementation of wellhead protection management practices
- Specify the roles and duties of agencies for each of the activities of the wellhead protection program
- Work with the California RWQCB on basin designations and identifying high-priority aquifers for groundwater development and high priority site cleanups
- Develop strategies the City can implement to reduce the threat of contamination from City facilities
- Develop a program to implement enforcement actions against entities responsible for contamination (this component of the program may require review and revision of the City's ordinances concerning groundwater)

The City does not currently have a wellhead protection program in place. In fact, the SFPUC is not the sole City department responsible for managing and protecting groundwater. Three other entities also have responsibilities. The San Francisco Department of Public Health is responsible for well permits and the investigation and remediation of industrial pollution sites. The San Francisco Department of Public Works Site Assessment and Remediation group assists in writing specifications for construction projects to prevent groundwater contamination and works with the

Department of Public Health in investigating and remediating contaminated sites. The California RWQCB is responsible for implementing Resolution 68-16, the state's groundwater anti-degradation policy.

Over the past 50 years, while most of the groundwater in the City has been used for nonpotable purposes, the permitting system has been adequate. However, with the SFPUC's current goal of developing and using groundwater for both potable and nonpotable uses, and with the increasing understanding of potential threats to groundwater quality, the SFPUC will work with the appropriate departments and agencies to develop a comprehensive wellhead protection program based on the components described above. Implementation of such a program will require revision of the duties and roles of the involved agencies.

Strategy 1C: Increase Hydrologic Data Regarding City's Groundwater Resource

Reliable groundwater data are the key to successful management of a groundwater basin. Long-term monitoring and analysis of groundwater levels, groundwater extractions, and groundwater quality allow more rapid identification of, and response to, changes attributable to manageable external influences (e.g., overdrafting or a leaking underground tank). Collecting and maintaining groundwater data in a usable format is necessary for managing the City's groundwater as a long-term resource.

Activity 1C1: Develop and Implement a Groundwater Monitoring Program

The SFPUC plans to develop a monitoring program to collect data on groundwater levels, extractions, and water quality to produce its groundwater database for the City's seven groundwater basins. For those basins underlying adjacent jurisdictions, the SFPUC will work closely with the applicable jurisdictions to collect and analyze appropriate data for the common benefit. Such a program would include both private and public dewatering, irrigation, extraction, monitoring, and supply wells. The monitoring program may also include measurement of water levels in Lake Merced, Lobos Creek, and any other surface water bodies that interact with local groundwater.

Data collected during the monitoring program will be entered in the GIS database developed as part of this Master Plan. The SFPUC's proposed Groundwater Management Unit (described in Section 4) will be responsible for conducting the annual monitoring program, updating the GIS database, and interpreting data to identify locations of possible declines in groundwater quality or quantity. These data may also be used to develop and update groundwater models of the City's basins.

Section Four - Goal 2: Coordinate Groundwater Use

To develop and manage the City's groundwater efficiently, the SFPUC must coordinate with its users, other City agencies, and neighboring political entities. Four long-term strategies have been identified to meet the goal of coordinated groundwater use (Figure 4-1). The short-term activities the SFPUC may undertake to implement each of the strategies are described below.

Strategy 2A: Establish SFPUC as Lead in City Groundwater Management

The SFPUC recognizes that implementing the long-term strategies and the short-term activities described in this Master Plan will require continued planning,

development, and monitoring, and that committed City resources are essential for such an undertaking to succeed.

Activity 2A1: Establish a Groundwater Management Unit Within the SFPUC

The SFPUC will form an internal Groundwater Management Unit. The new unit will be established as a resource for technical information about City groundwater and will act as a clearinghouse for distributing information to the public. Formation of this unit as early as possible during the implementation of the Master Plan will support its successful implementation.

Figure 4-1
GWMP Goal 2: Long-Term Strategies and Short-Term Activities

Goal	Long-Term Strategy	Short-Term Activity
2. Coordinate Groundwater Use	2A Establish SFPUC as lead in City groundwater management	2A1 Establish a Groundwater Management Unit within the SFPUC
	2B Improve coordination with other government agencies regulating/affecting groundwater use within the City	2B1 Form a City groundwater management committee
	2C Improve coordination with adjacent entities whose groundwater use affects shared groundwater basins	2C1 Form appropriate AB 3030 management committee(s)
	2D Enhance communication with City water customers	2D1 Develop and implement a public information program
M A N A G E M E N T		

The Groundwater Management Unit will likely consist of one supervisor-level hydrogeologist or hydrologist and two staff-level hydrogeologists or hydrologists. The supervising hydrogeologist or hydrologist should be a California-registered geologist or professional engineer.

The Groundwater Management Unit will be responsible for the following tasks:

- Implement Master Plan activities
- Develop new activities and strategies to help the City meet the goals outlined in the Master Plan
- Maintain, update, and use the GIS database and groundwater models
- Work with other City departments and adjacent political entities on activities involving City groundwater
- Respond to public inquiries about City groundwater
- Implement groundwater monitoring programs (collect data on groundwater level, use, and quality)
- Update the groundwater contribution to the overall City water balance
- Monitor groundwater quality in the City

- Implement relevant permitting programs (e.g., issuing well permits subject to California Environmental Quality Act [CEQA] review by the SFPUC, City Planning, and the Department of Health) in conjunction with other City departments

- Monitor local, state, and federal legislation relevant to the use, protection, or management of groundwater
- Support the SFPUC in efforts to foster new legislation for groundwater protection and use issues, both at City and state levels

Creation of the Groundwater Management Unit will be one of the first steps toward establishing the SFPUC as the lead agency in charge of managing the City's groundwater resources. Currently, Section 3.591 of the City's Charter defines the SFPUC as having authority over all utility properties and groundwater. However, outstanding issues will require attention through interagency agreements and the possible use of state groundwater management statutes.

Groundwater Underlying City-Owned Properties. Establishing the SFPUC as lead agency to manage the City's groundwater resources requires agreement with other City departments about the surface uses of land within these departments' jurisdiction. This could be accomplished through a Memorandum of Understanding (MOU) for the construction of facilities needed to manage groundwater beneath City-owned properties.

Groundwater Underlying Private Property. Groundwater underlying private property usually belongs, by law, to the overlying property owner who shares extraction rights in a correlative fashion with other overlying landowners. However, the City holds rights to all groundwater in San Francisco based on its historic Pueblo water right to all water within the boundaries of the historic Pueblo of San Francisco. Additionally, the Groundwater Management Unit of the SFPUC could represent the City and work in partnership with agencies outside the City limits by forming a water or replenishment district or by developing an AB 3030 Groundwater Management Plan. A water or replenishment district is formed through state legislation; an AB 3030 management district is formed by passing a resolution to develop an AB 3030 plan, developing the management plan, and allowing the public to approve the plan following a public review. Requirements for the AB 3030 process are outlined in the California Water Code (10750 et seq.) and discussed on page 4-4 of this Master Plan.

***Strategy 2B: Improve
Coordination with Other
Government Agencies
Regulating/Affecting Groundwater
Use Within the City***

This strategy facilitates cooperation among agencies so that policies of one agency do not conflict or interfere with the policies of other agencies. Currently, the activities of several City departments, and a number of state and

federal agencies, affect the disposition of City groundwater. These departments are as follows:

- The City Recreation and Park Department, which is the largest groundwater user in the City, mainly at Golden Gate Park (a high percentage of this water is recharged back to the aquifer)
- The City Planning Department, which approves developments that may affect groundwater quality
- The California Department of Health Services and the City's Department of Public Health, which enforce potable water quality regulations
- The RWQCB, the City Department of Public Health, and the SFPUC, which regulate clean up of groundwater contamination and mandate groundwater quality monitoring at its point source
- The U.S. EPA, which regulates clean up of soil and groundwater contamination at sites included on the National Priorities List (Superfund sites)
- The City Fire Department (responsible for the Auxiliary Water Supply System [AWSS]), which provides emergency supplies to large parts of the City and whose existing distribution system may receive groundwater from dewatering operations
- The NPS, which manages groundwater use at the Presidio in the Lobos Basin

Activity 2B1: Form a City Groundwater Management Committee

As a first step in improving coordination among agencies, the SFPUC will take the lead by establishing a committee of representatives from the agencies listed above who will have some involvement in groundwater production, use, and distribution. This committee will:

- Determine guidelines for communication, permitting, and interjurisdictional coordination of activities (including active well monitoring)
- Coordinate development of subcommittees to address groundwater conditions in City basins (such as AB 3030 plans)
- Develop a management plan outlining the responsibilities and authorities of each member agency

Strategy 2C: Improve Coordination with Adjacent Entities Whose Groundwater Use Affects Shared Groundwater Basins


The City shares portions of the Westside, Islais Valley, and Visitacion Valley Basins with political entities south of the City boundary (Figure 4-2). Effective basin management must include coordinated groundwater pumping

and storage with other users to maintain the basins as long-term groundwater resources. Recent California legislation, AB 3030, facilitates joint management of a groundwater basin by multiple entities.

Activity 2C1: Form Appropriate AB 3030 Management Committee(s)

AB 3030 was passed by the California State Legislature in 1992 to encourage local public water agencies and other such entities to jointly develop and manage groundwater basins. This bill provides guidelines for developing inter-jurisdictional agreements and suggests activities that could be included in groundwater management plans. These include, but are not limited to, activities that protect water quality and quantity (Figure 4-3).

Through this Master Plan, the SFPUC has begun several activities that may become components of an AB 3030 plan for various basins. The SFPUC may continue all or some of these activities for one or more of the seven groundwater basins discussed in this document. For two of the basins (South and Downtown Basins), only City departments and private landowners would be involved in developing basin groundwater management strategies. In five of the basins (Lobos, Marina, Westside, Islais Valley, and Visitacion Valley Basins), City departments, private landowners, and other political entities (such as Daly City or the NPS) and local utilities (California Water Service) would be involved in forming an AB 3030 plan (or equivalent).



Water Quality Protection

- Control of seawater intrusion
- Regulation of the migration of contaminated groundwater
- Review of land use plans and coordination with land use planning agencies to assess activities that create a reasonable risk of groundwater contamination
- Identification and management of wellhead protection areas and recharge areas

- Construction and operation by the local agency of groundwater contamination cleanup, recharge, conservation, water recycling, and extraction projects
- Administration of a well abandonment and well destruction program
- Identification of well construction policies
- Development of relationships with state and federal agencies

- Mitigation of conditions of overdraft
- Replenishment of groundwater extracted by water producers
- Monitoring of groundwater levels and storage
- Facilitating of conjunctive use operations

Water Quantity Protection

Figure 4-3
Groundwater Management Under AB 3030

The SFPUC, the Cities of Daly City and San Bruno, and the California Water Service are working towards preparing a cooperative AB 3030 plan for the Westside Basin. This plan will facilitate development (addressing groundwater use issues within the basins) of a cooperative long-term solution to the problem of declining water levels such as at Lake Merced (see Activities 3A1 [Conduct additional field investigation at Lake Merced] and 3A2 [Conduct modeling to estimate effects of specific groundwater pumping patterns on Lake Merced water levels] in Section 5).

Strategy 2D: Enhance Communication with City Water Customers

The SFPUC believes that a strong public involvement program will be important to foster customer understanding and support of the strategies and activities described in this Master Plan as well as the potential impacts of implementing the Master Plan. For example, the chemical constituents in groundwater vary from those of the existing surface water supply. This may result in a slight change in taste to San Francisco's water supply. Additionally, implementation of the program will have cost impacts.

Activity 2D1: Develop and Implement a Public Information Program

A joint information program for the groundwater and recycled water programs has been implemented during the development of the groundwater and recycled programs. This joint information program is planned to be continued. The purpose of such a program is to educate and communicate with the public regarding the work planned in the two master plans. The approach to the Public Information Program includes:

- Centralize the SFPUC's interactions with the public to ensure consistency and credibility in communications and actions
- Define key messages to convey to SFPUC customers

- Designate a SFPUC member as spokesperson
- Identify customer groups that need special involvement efforts
- Establish a schedule and criteria for fact sheets and bulletins
- Distribute fact sheets and bulletins for anticipated events (e.g., field investigations, water quality monitoring, and well construction) and for unanticipated or not-yet-planned events (e.g., declining lake levels, future development activities)
- Distribute information to the public by way of the SFPUC 's newsletter inserted into water bills, articles written for the Recycled Water/ Groundwater Program newsletter, or the local media
- Develop and update an informational slide show
- Prepare appropriate public involvement milestones
- Hold a series of public meetings to present the results of the two master plans to the public and to address any public concerns that may arise

Section Five - Goal 3: Protect and Conserve Related Water Resource

The SFPUC understands the need to consider the effects of groundwater development on surface water bodies and on local ecosystems that depend on water for survival. Of special concern are the potential environmental effects of changing water levels in surface water bodies within the SFPUC's jurisdiction as a result of groundwater pumping. To address this concern, the SFPUC has identified two long-term strategies for surface water features within its jurisdiction (Figure 5-1).

Strategy 3A: Manage Lake Water Levels

Lakes within the City serve as emergency water supplies, are wildlife habitats, and provide recreation. Changing lake water levels affects these uses. The SFPUC is committed to maintaining City lakes at levels that meet the balanced requirements of the potential uses. Figure 5-2 shows the locations of the major lakes within the City.

Figure 5-1
GWMP Goal 3: Long-Term Strategies and Short-Term Activities

Goal	Long-Term Strategy	Short-Term Activity
3. Protect and Conserve Related Water Resources	3A Manage lake water levels	3A1 Conduct additional field investigation at Lake Merced 3A2 Conduct modeling to estimate effects of specific groundwater pumping patterns on Lake Merced water levels 3A3 Evaluate relationship between other City lakes and groundwater 3A4 Develop and implement policies and procedures to manage water levels in City lakes
	3B Manage stream water levels	3B1 Assess effects of groundwater development on Lobos Creek 3B2 Evaluate relationship between other City streams and groundwater 3B3 Develop and implement procedures to manage water levels in City streams

MANASSAS, VA 20108-1000




Figure 5-2
*Location of Major Free-Flowing
and Historic Creeks and Lakes*

Activity 3A1: Conduct Additional Field Investigation at Lake Merced

Water levels in Lake Merced, the largest lake in the City, have been declining steadily over the past several years (Figure 5-3). The City's study of the Lake Merced area

(Geo/Resource, 1993) included development of a ground-water flow model of the area (the Lake Merced Model, shown in Figure 5-4) and provided recommendations for optimum lake levels for wildlife, water quality issues, and developing lake management strategies. The 1993 recommendations for maintaining the optimum water level in Lake Merced were as follows:





Figure 5-3
Changes in the Surface
Elevation of Lake Merced



- Add imported water directly to the lake
- Add deep aquifer water directly to the lake
- Increase stormwater runoff into the lake
- Substitute recycled water for local groundwater used for irrigation
- Decrease groundwater outflow from Lake Merced to the ocean by recharging coastal groundwater with recycled water

Data collected during the development of this Master Plan indicate that Lake Merced is closely but not directly related to the water table. Because there is no surface water outlet from the lake, and surface water inflow from stormwater runoff is slight or infrequent, the lake level is most sensitive to recharge from precipitation and, to a lesser degree, to local groundwater extraction (Figure 5-5). Water levels in the lake will rise and fall as groundwater levels rise and fall. The recent drought; groundwater pumping by the municipalities, cemeteries, and golf courses in the vicinity of Lake Merced; and the diversion of runoff that formerly went to the lake each have contributed to the declining water levels in the lake. These factors necessitate integrating increasing water levels in Lake Merced with managing the basin and sustaining groundwater levels.




Figure 5-5a
Lake Merced is an Expression of the Local Groundwater
Table Under Non-Pumping Conditions




Figure 5-5b
Water in Lake Merced is Affected by Local Pumping

The City has attempted an active approach in response to the declining surface water levels in Lake Merced. Twice during 1994 dechlorinated surface water was added to the lake at a daily rate of 5 mgd for periods of 30 days. Data from the USGS recorder in the lake show that this action raised the lake levels between 2 and 3 feet during each event. However, immediately after water addition to the lake ceased, lake levels declined (Figure 5-6), indicating that adding water for short periods of time affects water levels only locally and temporarily and is not a viable

alternative for restoring and sustaining water levels at Lake Merced. Water has been added to Lake Merced several times since 1994.

The City has recently assessed the ability of the Lake Merced Model to evaluate groundwater management strategies for the Lake Merced area. As part of this assessment, the model was verified using available 1991 to 1993 groundwater data and 1994 data collected during the addition of water to the lake. The validation confirmed the results of the earlier model calibration. The assessment also indicated that the model represents well the average annual changes in lake levels for comparison of relative (although not absolute) benefits of various lake level management strategies. However, because of the model's construction, it is able to predict only general trends in water levels changes within the aquifer (not precise changes), especially in areas of high pumping that occur south of Lake Merced. The City may use the Lake Merced Model in the future to assess alternative water management strategies identified in Activity 3A2 (Conduct modeling to estimate effects of specific groundwater pumping patterns on Lake Merced water levels). In addition, the basin-wide model is being developed.

The data used to develop and calibrate the Lake Merced Model were collected by the USGS in the late 1980s as part of a comprehensive groundwater monitoring program for the Lake Merced area. This program ended in 1990 and data collected since then have been sparse. Therefore, the hydrologic data set in the Lake Merced area has some limitations:




Figure 5-6

SOURCE: USGS Recorder 11162680 Lake Merced at Pumphouse. *Changes in the Surface Elevation of Lake Merced (detail of Figure 5-3) Resulting from 5-mgd Recharge*

- There are few data points for evaluating the migration of water from the lake to the ocean.

Collection of additional data as part of a comprehensive study of the Westside Basin would accomplish several objectives. First, it would increase the City's understanding of the groundwater system in the vicinity of Lake Merced by incorporating and comparing that data to the data collected previously by the USGS. Second, it would assist in the evaluation of the effectiveness of specific groundwater management approaches on Lake Merced water levels. Finally, it would allow expansion of the existing groundwater model to incorporate the entire Westside Basin and facilitate the model's use as a basin management tool.

- There are no data points to measure the hydraulic communication between the shallow aquifer (which includes Lake Merced) and the deep aquifer (where most of the large-scale pumping occurs).
- Adequate pumping records are not maintained by some of the local water users.
- There are few groundwater measuring points that are not in active production wells.

The proposed approach to additional data collection includes the following actions:

- Install up to eight additional monitoring wells (two single wells and three well pairs consisting of one well each in the shallow and deep aquifers)
- Collect comprehensive sets of groundwater levels, possibly with one set collected in conjunction with a third period of lake recharge
- Collect pumping records from major groundwater users within the basin

- Incorporate data into the City's GIS database
- Analyze newly collected data
- Develop groundwater management alternatives for the Lake Merced area

On May 23, 1995, the City's Public Utility Commission adopted Resolution 95-0082 which contained findings and a list of actions that the Commission is prepared to take to address the continuing decline in the water level of Lake Merced. The Groundwater and Recycled Water Master Plans will provide the City with relevant information and enable the City to make final decisions regarding the management of groundwater and recycled water in San Francisco.

Continued unmanaged groundwater pumping may cause the water level of Lake Merced to decline further with many deleterious effects. The Commission concluded that cooperative groundwater management efforts, conjunctive operations, substitution of recycled water for groundwater, and better tools to relate groundwater pumping to Lake Merced water levels would help stabilize lake levels. Based upon declining Lake Merced water levels and the activities being pursued to evaluate the situation, the Commission adopted the following actions and activities:

1. The Commission is prepared to take all necessary actions (legal and other) to halt the continued decline in water level of Lake Merced.
2. A conjunctive use program was approved.

3. Staff is to extend planning and groundwater modeling efforts south of San Francisco County line and to formulate a partnership with and seek financial participation with Daly City, San Bruno, and the California Water Service Company.
4. The golf courses in the vicinity of Lake Merced have been asked to determine the suitability of tertiary-treated water from Daly City for golf course irrigation.
5. Staff is to prepare "in lieu" water contracts to deliver in lieu water (from surplus surface water supplies) to Daly City, San Bruno, and the California Water Service Company.
6. Staff is to advise the Commission of the feasibility of banking all or a portion of the potable water made available by the substitution of recycled water for other sources of water in the Merced aquifer.
7. Staff is to develop a plan which evaluates the addition of other sources of recharge water to the Merced aquifer.

Activity 3A2: Conduct Modeling to Estimate Effects of Specific Groundwater Pumping Patterns on Lake Merced Water Levels

Data from Activity 3A1 (Conduct additional field investigation at Lake Merced), the USGS, Bay Area Water Users Association (BAWUA), and other Westside Basin studies will be used to expand the existing model to include the entire Westside Basin. A series of different

recharge and pumping scenarios will be modeled and alternative management practices to restore Lake Merced water levels will be recommended. Potential scenarios to be considered may include:

- What would be the effects of adding 1 mgd, 2 mgd, or 3 mgd to the lake (during nonnesting periods)?
- What would be the effects on the lake if pumping were stopped or reduced and users were supplied imported water?
- What would be the effects on the lake if the golf courses used recycled water? This scenario was tested by Geo/Resource (1993) and would only be re-evaluated if data from Activity 3A1 (Conduct additional field investigation at Lake Merced) indicated different hydraulic conditions.

Management of the Westside Basin is integrally related to the management of water levels at Lake Merced, as stated previously. Ideally, Activities 3A1 and 3A2 will be conducted concurrently with the AB 3030 development conducted under Activity 2C1 (Form appropriate AB 3030 management committee[s]). Each of these activities will provide information to show the importance of managing the basin as a common resource and the mechanism to do so. With the mechanism of AB 3030 in place, the findings of Activity 3A2 will be implementable.

Activity 3A3: Evaluate Relationship Between Other City Lakes and Groundwater

The SFPUC will survey lakes and other surface water features (including Pine and Mountain Lakes) within the City and prepare a baseline evaluation of the relationship between each lake, other surface water features, and the local groundwater. Additional monitoring devices (i.e., monitoring wells, staff gauges) be installed and a database developed for use in evaluating potential future impacts on the City's lakes.

Activity 3A4: Develop and Implement Policies and Procedures to Manage Water Levels in City Lakes

Based on an evaluation of the modeling results for Activity 3A2, the SFPUC will develop and implement policies and procedures to manage water levels in City lakes, focusing initially on Lake Merced, Pine Lake, and Mountain Lake. Managing water levels will require cooperation and coordination among the different water users in the areas surrounding these lakes. The SFPUC will work closely with the groups formed during Activities 2B1 (Form a City groundwater committee) and 2C1 (Form appropriate AB 3030 management committee[s]) to implement Activity 3A4.

Strategy 3B: Manage Stream Water Levels

Historically, surface water runoff traveled from the hills of the City to San Francisco Bay and the Pacific Ocean via streams and creeks at the bottoms of valleys. With the settlement and development of the City, stream beds were filled or paved. The only remaining unfilled, free-flowing creek in the City is Lobos Creek (see Figure 5-2); however, the Recreation and Park Department is planning stream restoration in Glen Canyon.

Activity 3B1: Assess Effects of Groundwater Development on Lobos Creek

The SFPUC is committed to helping preserve the environmental resources provided by Lobos Creek. Lobos Creek's flow of 1.6 mgd (1,800 acre-feet per year) is fed almost entirely by groundwater seepage and is collected by surface diversion and extraction wells to the water treatment plant at the Presidio. Approximately 70 percent of the diverted flow is currently used; the remainder is discharged to the Pacific Ocean. The SFPUC has begun to assess the relationship between Lobos Creek and the Lobos Basin and the development potential of the basin. Lobos Creek is managed by the NPS. Talks had been initiated between the City and NPS regarding the Lobos Basin issue.

Proposed development plans for the Presidio under NPS management are uncertain at this time.

The SFPUC's potential study of the Lobos Basin (Activity 5D1—Develop and implement a study of the Lobos Basin)

will provide baseline data to be used in evaluating the potential for groundwater development in the Lobos Basin and its possible effects on Lobos Creek.

Activity 3B2: Evaluate Relationship Between Other City Streams and Groundwater

The SFPUC intends to survey other City streams (filled) and prepare a baseline evaluation of the interconnection of the streams with other water bodies within the watershed and with groundwater. This information would help in the evaluation of the potential environmental impacts of groundwater development on streams and may assist the Recreation and Park Department in its stream restoration efforts. The SFPUC, in cooperation with other City departments, will identify streams targeted for evaluation. This evaluation may include assessment of historical data, installation of additional monitoring devices (such as monitoring wells) and incorporation of collected data into the Master Plan database.

Activity 3B3: Develop and Implement Policies and Procedures to Manage Water Levels in City Streams

The SFPUC will use the information obtained from Activities 3B1 (Assess effects of groundwater development on Lobos Creek) and 3B2 (Evaluate relationship between other City streams and groundwater) to develop and implement policies and procedures to manage water levels in targeted City streams. This effort will include Lobos Creek, which lies within the Presidio, and will require cooperation between the NPS and the SFPUC.

Section Six - Goal 4: Improve Ability to Deliver Water During Emergencies

The SFPUC's ability to supply water to both its retail (City) and wholesale (Peninsula, East Bay, and South Bay) customers is at risk during earthquakes, chemical spills, and periods of intense firefighting. As part of this Master Plan, one long-term strategy (Figure 6-1) has been identified whereby groundwater could strengthen the SFPUC's ability to react to these potential emergencies.

Strategy 4A: Evaluate Use of Groundwater as an Emergency Reserve

The SFPUC delivers approximately 85 percent of their water to customers through transmission lines running from the Tuolumne River Basin to the Bay Area (Figure 6-2). Ten percent of the water delivered to the SFPUC's customers comes from East Bay reservoirs (Calaveras and San Antonio Reservoirs) and 5 percent from Peninsula reservoirs (Crystal Springs, Pilarcitos, and San Andreas Reservoirs). The transmission lines conveying water from


these sources cross several faults and are vulnerable to damage from earthquakes. According to SFPUC's Emergency Operations Plan (San Francisco SFPUC, 1993), the two most vulnerable locations in the system are where the Hetch Hetchy Aqueduct crosses the Calaveras and Hayward Faults (Figure 6-2). A break in the transmission lines at either of these locations could severely affect the Bay Area's water supply. The City maintains a reserve supply of several months by storage in Peninsula and City reservoirs, but this reserve is vulnerable to breaks in the Peninsula distribution system and reservoir infrastructure from earthquakes on the San Andreas Fault system.

The City's water supply is also vulnerable to chemical spills. Crystal Springs Reservoir is crossed by Highway 92 and is vulnerable to accidental spills. In addition, a petroleum pipeline crosses the watershed of the San Antonio Reservoir. If either a spill or pipeline break were to occur, a portion of the City's water supply could be affected.

Figure 6-1
GWMP Goal 4: Long-Term Strategies and Short-Term Activities

Goal	Long-Term Strategy	Short-Term Activity
4. Improve Ability to Deliver Water During Emergencies	4A Evaluate use of groundwater as an emergency reserve	4A1 Study the feasibility of installing large-capacity standby wells 4A2 Design, install and operate large-capacity standby wells, if appropriate 4A3 Update the SFPUC's Emergency Operations Plan

DEVELOPMENT AND USE



Reference: Emergency Operations Plan
(EQE International, 1993)

Figure 6-2
*Location of San Francisco Water Supply
Facilities Potentially Vulnerable in an Earthquake*

Periods of intensive firefighting can also affect the City's water supply by quickly consuming water available in the City's AWSS and reservoirs. Severe fires can follow a major earthquake, exacerbating water shortages that might already have resulted from the earthquake itself. To prepare for such disasters, the SFPUC has identified two short-term activities that could further support existing City emergency plans.

Activity 4A1: Study the Feasibility of Installing Large Capacity Standby Wells

The SFPUC will study the feasibility of installing large-capacity wells to supply critically needed potable and nonpotable water in emergencies. These wells would be standby wells that would operate only as needed. The SFPUC's current plan is for the large-capacity wells and their associated systems to operate both independently and with the existing water distribution system and the AWSS. Such operational scenarios would provide flexibility and system redundancy for responding to critical water emergencies.

Lake Merced is currently designated as an emergency drinking water supply for the City of San Francisco. However, the City plans to evaluate the potential water quality and health impacts on both Lake Merced and the Westside Basin if tertiary-treated recycled water is added directly to the lake. If addition of recycled water results in changing the designation of Lake Merced from a potable emergency water supply to a non-potable emergency water supply, the City will need to identify a replacement emergency potable water supply. Large-capacity standby wells could serve as this replacement, depending on the volume of water that can be obtained from the groundwater wells.

If Lake Merced is maintained as an emergency drinking water supply, its water would have to be boiled before use and distributed via portable piping and trucks. Groundwater available for potable use during emergencies would require less treatment than Lake Merced water, which could be used for nonpotable emergency uses, such as for firefighting.

Possible well locations will be identified based on the following:

- Existing information about potential potable and nonpotable water needs of an area
- Timing and supply of recycled water to the area
- Short-term water supply potential of the aquifer
- Groundwater quality conditions
- Compatibility of the location to the existing infrastructure

Activity 4A2: Design, Install, and Operate Large-Capacity Standby Wells, if Appropriate

The SFPUC will determine which of the well locations identified in Activity 4A1 (Study the feasibility of installing large-capacity standby wells) will proceed to the design and construct phase of Activity 4A2. Test wells will be installed and tested at each location to verify the initial estimates of potential well yield at that location. If the results are confirmed and meet the needs of the SFPUC, further design activities will be conducted.

Design specifications for the wells to be installed will include well construction (well depth, pumping capacity, etc.), well housing, and well piping.

Once the wells are installed, operational guidelines will be developed for routine testing and maintenance together with procedures to follow when the wells are operated during emergencies.

Activity 4A3: Update the SFPUC's Emergency Operations Plan

The SFPUC currently has an Emergency Operations Plan (EOP) (San Francisco Water Department, 1993) for maintaining water distribution during emergencies. This plan could change twice during the implementation of the Master Plan. The first version of the EOP will occur if the designation of Lake Merced as an emergency potable water supply is changed. The second revision will occur at the end of the design of the wells conducted during Activity 4A2. This update will include information on operating the proposed large-capacity standby wells and putting the pumped groundwater into the City's distribution system and/or AWSS. The plan's revisions may also address other groundwater-related emergency strategies developed in response to this Master Plan.

Section Seven - Goal 5: Maximize Groundwater Use

As previously described, groundwater currently supplies a portion of the City's water demand, and the amount supplied could potentially be increased. The SFPUC has identified five long-term strategies for increasing groundwater use, as shown in Figure 7-1.

The City's long-term goal is to maximize, to the extent practical, the amount of groundwater used for beneficial purposes within San Francisco. The term "maximize groundwater use" means that the City's goal is to undertake a set of long-term actions that will increase the use of groundwater without overriding cost, customer response, or risk to groundwater quality and quantity. Short-term activities are suggested that increase groundwater use at moderate exposure to the potential effects noted above. Long-term activities will build on the lessons learned during the implementation of the short-term activities.

San Francisco fully intends to develop comprehensive groundwater management programs to meet the water resources needs and obligations of the 21st century. The lessons learned and the success of the City's efforts will set an example that will encourage its wholesale customers to implement similar programs.

The SFPUC used a number of criteria to evaluate the feasibility of implementing each short-term activity involving groundwater extraction and distribution. These criteria included the cost of developing and delivering the groundwater, potential customer response to receiving groundwater or a blend of surface water and groundwater, the technical feasibility of an activity, and the availability

of groundwater in the basin under current groundwater conditions (recognizing that the SFPUC would develop, at most, less than the average annual recharge shown in Table 2-2; however, artificially increasing recharge to a basin could increase the amount of available groundwater). Each of these strategies and the short-term activities the SFPUC may implement are summarized following a discussion of potential groundwater users.

Potential Groundwater Users

The SFPUC focused on the four groups of City water users who would be potential groundwater customers. These groups are:

- Individual nonpotable users
- Individual potable users
- Local distribution system users
- Main distribution system users

The individual nonpotable user group is the same group of users identified in the Recycled Water Master Plan as possible recipients of recycled water. The SFPUC recognizes that its potable users could notice taste differences between the surface water they currently receive and groundwater. To minimize the potential for such taste changes, the SFPUC would blend the surface water and groundwater before supplying it to its customers during nonemergency operations. The SFPUC also identified two groups of distribution system users based

Figure 7-1

GWMP Goal 5: Long-Term Strategies and Short-Term Activities

Goal	Long-Term Strategy	Short-Term Activity
5. Maximize Groundwater Use	5A Capture groundwater outflow to the San Francisco Bay or Pacific Ocean	5A1 Extract groundwater from Elk Glen Well; add to main distribution system 5A2 Extract groundwater from the Sunset District, add to main distribution system
	5B Capture groundwater produced by dewatering operations	5B1 Add groundwater to the AWSS from dewatering at the Powell Street BART 5B2 Identify permanent dewatering operation in the City and identify potential beneficial uses for the water 5B3 Develop procedures to put temporary construction dewatering water to beneficial use 5B4 Evaluate the feasibility of using, and implement if appropriate, the existing sludge line to convey non-potable water to the North Point plant
	5C Operate groundwater basins conjunctively	5C1 Conduct in-lieu recharge of the southern portion of the Westside Basin 5C2 Conduct conjunctive use in the Lobos Basin
	5D Investigate other groundwater basins	5D1 Develop and implement a study of the Lobos Basin 5D2 Develop and implement studies of other shared and City basins
	5E Evaluate other potential activities for increasing groundwater use	5E1 Evaluate, and implement where feasible, potential groundwater use in the City's fountains and decorative pools 5E2 Evaluate, and implement where feasible, the potential for groundwater to help control corrosion in the City's water distribution system

DEVELOPMENT AND USE

on the premise that groundwater is most economically delivered when a greater number of users are served with the fewest facilities.

Individual Nonpotable Users. Nonpotable uses of groundwater include irrigation of large landscaped areas (such as parks, golf courses, and athletic fields), toilet flushing and cooling in commercial areas, firefighting, and decorative fountains (Figure 7-2). As noted previously,

the SFPUC is planning the coordinated use of groundwater and recycled water throughout the City. In the future, water from three sources may be available for nonpotable users, to be supplied according to the following general priorities: first, recycled water; second, groundwater (where recycled water is unavailable or inappropriate); and finally, surface water (where both recycled water and groundwater are unavailable or inappropriate). However, the actual source of a user's nonpotable




Figure 7-2
*Integrated Use of Surface, Recycled, and
Groundwater to Meet Water Needs*

supply would depend on a number of factors, including economics and water quality requirements.

In San Francisco, the large users of nonpotable water are Golden Gate Park, the zoo, and the golf courses near Lake Merced. These users are targeted to receive recycled water to fill all or part of their nonpotable water needs by the year 2001. Between 1997 and 2001, users currently receiving groundwater would continue to do so. Small nonpotable users are the large buildings in the Downtown Basin. Groundwater would be considered as a potential supply for nonpotable users in large buildings in the Downtown Basin because recycled water will not be delivered there.

Individual Potable Users. For purposes of this Master Plan, individual potable users are those for whom the SFPUC could extract, treat, and deliver groundwater directly as potable water (Figure 7-3). Schools and large retail or commercial complexes (e.g., commercial laundries) are examples of such potential users.

Local Distribution System Users. As shown in Figure 7-4, local distribution system users are connected to the City's water mains measuring less than 12 inches in diameter. For these users, the SFPUC could extract, treat, and inject groundwater into the local distribution system where it would blend the groundwater with the surface water already in the system.




Figure 7-3
Use of Groundwater for Individual Potable Uses




Figure 7-4
Use of Groundwater in the Local Distribution System

Main Distribution System Users. Main distribution lines are 12 inches in diameter or greater and are used to transport water around the City. No users are connected directly to the City's water mains, but some are supplied water from the main distribution system by feeder lines measuring 6 or 8 inches in diameter. The SFPUC could extract and either treat or blend groundwater (if it does not meet drinking water standards) with surface water before injecting the blended water into the main distribution system, or inject groundwater directly into the main distribution system (if it meets drinking water standards) where the two water sources would be blended.

Strategy 5A: Capture Groundwater Outflow to the San Francisco Bay or Pacific Ocean

In San Francisco groundwater basins, annual recharge is provided through both natural (rainfall) and incidental (pipe losses and irrigation return flow) processes. As noted in Section 2, the estimated amount of average annual recharge in each basin generally exceeds ground-

water withdrawal. Recharge not captured by pumping becomes part of the subsurface groundwater reservoir, which discharges into the Pacific Ocean or the San Francisco Bay, depending on the basin's location (Figure 7-5).

The following discussion summarizes known information on groundwater outflow from each basin and presents the approach used to identify potential projects being considered further by the SFPUC.

Westside Basin. The Westside Basin has the most subsurface outflow available for capture. Currently, about 2,500 acre-feet of groundwater is extracted from the northern portion of the Westside Basin, primarily in Golden Gate Park and at the zoo and golf courses near Lake Merced. Based on an estimated average recharge of 4,900 acre-feet per year, a portion of the additional 2,400 acre-feet of groundwater could be withdrawn from parts of the northern portion of the Westside Basin without adverse impacts within the basin. A portion of this water, used primarily for irrigation in Golden Gate Park and irrigation and pool-filling at the zoo, is scheduled to be replaced with recycled water by the year 2001. Master plans prepared for both Golden Gate Park (San Francisco Recreation and Park




Figure 7-5
Groundwater Recharge in San Francisco

Department, 1994 draft) and the zoo (City and County of San Francisco, Department of Public Works, 1995) specify the water supply needs of both areas. Once these areas are supplied with recycled water, all or part of the replaced water could be used for other development projects. The SFPUC and Recreation and Park Departments will work together to coordinate these water use projects.

Downtown Basin. The Downtown Basin is the second largest basin in the City (after the Westside Basin) and the largest on the east side. It is about 200 feet deep (relatively shallow compared to the Westside Basin, which is 3,500 feet deep) and has an estimated existing recharge of 5,900 acre-feet per year. Approximately 800 acre-feet per year of documented groundwater extraction occurs in the Downtown Basin from current dewatering operations (although the Department of Public Works estimates that there may be dewatering operations contributing additional water to sewer flow, the volume has not been quantified and is considered to be minimal). Future groundwater development in the Downtown Basin depends on a number of issues such as the high potential for land subsidence and water quality within the basin. Therefore, for the purposes of this Master Plan, the SFPUC is considering only Downtown Basin activities that would use groundwater extracted from dewatering operations in a nonpotable manner (e.g., toilet flushing, wash water, and climate control). These activities are discussed as part of Strategy 5B.

Lobos Basin. Based on existing recharge estimates using 1987-1988 water level data, groundwater extraction in the Lobos Basin (primarily at the Presidio) exceeds existing

recharge (Table 2-2). However, these numbers may be low because the estimated amount of existing recharge is not exact and data used in its calculation were from drought years. Additional groundwater development in the Lobos Basin may be possible. The SFPUC is working to verify the existing recharge estimate and to determine the potential for additional groundwater development in the Lobos Basin (Activity 5D1—Develop and implement a study of the Lobos Basin).

Other Basins. Insufficient information is available regarding the aquifers in the Marina, Islais Valley, South, and Visitacion Valley Basins. Additional information is required regarding existing water quality and aquifer characteristics so that the SFPUC can identify potential potable and/or nonpotable uses for the groundwater within these basins.

Approach to Identifying Groundwater Development Activities. Based on the SFPUC's preliminary evaluation, the Westside Basin has the greatest potential to capture groundwater outflow. Water from the tested areas within the basin is potable, annual recharge is greater than annual use in the northern portion of the basin, and a portion of the current use will be converted to recycled water in the year 2000. This will allow for development of the replaced groundwater for other uses. Table 7-1 summarizes activities the SFPUC preliminarily considered for capturing and using a portion of the 4,900 acre-feet per year of the annual recharge within the northern part of the Westside Basin. The SFPUC will meet the needs of Golden Gate Park before implementing the activities discussed in the following sections.

Table 7-1
Potential Activities to Capture Groundwater Lost to the Pacific Ocean in the Northern Portion of the Westside Basin

User Group	Activity	Assumption	Benefit	Amount (ac-ft/yr)	Potential Constraints
Individual NonPotable Users (Without Treatment)	Install well at Ocean View Playground	Onsite location for well exists	Replace imported potable supply being used for nonpotable with groundwater	20	Incentive to user?
	Install well at West Sunset Playground	Onsite location for well exists	Replace imported potable supply being used for nonpotable with groundwater	39	Incentive to user?
	Install well at Laguna Honda Home	Onsite location for well exists	Replace imported potable supply being used for nonpotable with groundwater	8	Incentive to user?
Individual Potable Users (With Treatment)	Install well at St. Mary's Hospital	Onsite location for well and chlorination exists	Replace imported potable supply with groundwater	110	Minimum blend
	Install well at State of California, Font Boulevard	Onsite location for well and chlorination exists	Replace imported potable supply with groundwater	156	Located close to Lake Merced; minimum blend
	Install well at Stonestown Properties	Onsite location for well and chlorination exists	Replace imported potable supply with groundwater	96	Located close to Lake Merced; minimum blend
	Install well at San Francisco State	Onsite location for well and chlorination exists	Replace imported potable supply with groundwater	88	Located close to Lake Merced; minimum blend
	Install well at Lake Merced Sports Center	Onsite location for well and chlorination exists	Replace imported potable supply with groundwater	48	Located close to Lake Merced; minimum blend
Local Distribution System Users (With Treatment)	Install two or three wells near 44th, and inject into local pipeline	Well and chlorination sites exist	Supply additional potable water to SFPUC system	800-900	Medium blend, affects local neighborhood
	Operate Elk Glen Well for maximum extraction amount, inject into local pipeline	Existing well is okay for production of potable water or would cost minimal amount to improve; Elk Glen area can sustain higher levels of pumping	Supply additional potable water to SFPUC system	500-900 [0-500 ac-ft/yr rec and park use at Elk Glen]	Medium blend; affects local neighborhood
	Construct new well at Elk Glen location, inject into local pipeline	Elk Glen irrigation well unsuitable for production and therefore retired; Elk Glen area can sustain higher levels of pumping	Supply additional potable water to SFPUC system	500-900 [0-500 ac-ft/yr rec and park use at Elk Glen]	Medium blend; affects local neighborhood
Main Distribution System Users (With Treatment)	Install two or three wells near 44th and extend piping up to large-diameter piping going out of Sunset Reservoir	Well and chlorination sites exist	Supply additional potable water to SFPUC system	800-900	
	Operate Elk Glen Well for maximum extraction amount, inject into main pipeline	Existing well is okay for production of potable water or would cost minimal amount to improve, Elk Glen area can sustain higher levels of pumping	Supply additional potable water to SFPUC system	500-900 [0-500 ac-ft/yr rec and park use at Elk Glen]	
	Construct one well south of Golden Gate Park near 23rd, inject into large-diameter main	Well and chlorination sites exist	Supply additional potable water to SFPUC system	800	Potential alternative if existing Elk Glen Well is not suitable
	Convert existing deep monitoring well at Stern Grove into production well, inject into large-diameter main	Well is convertible from monitoring well	Supply additional potable water to SFPUC system	1,100	Located close to Lake Merced
	Construct new well at Stern Grove, inject into large-diameter main		Supply additional potable water to SFPUC system	1,100	Located close to Lake Merced

Note: Shaded activities are discussed in the text of this report. Those not shaded were not considered further and may be considered in future projects.

As shown in Table 7-1, three Westside Basin activities could use groundwater to supply individual, nonpotable users who will not receive recycled water; five activities could supply groundwater to individual potable users; three activities could supply groundwater to potable users via the local water distribution system; and five activities could supply groundwater to potable users via the main water distribution system. Each of these activities is in an area where groundwater has been tested and found to be potable (although additional water quality sampling would be needed to verify that extracted groundwater meets all drinking water criteria).

Using five criteria, the SFPUC selected two short-term activities (the projects are shaded) from the 16 activities summarized in Table 7-1 for further consideration. Those projects not selected may be considered in the future. The criteria used were as follows:

- **Cost of Producing Water**—Figure 7-6 shows how the cost of producing water varies per acre-foot for each of the 16 activities considered. The cost of producing and distributing the water was not the sole criterion for choosing the short-term activities; the SFPUC also considered the present and future economic state of the City in making its decision.
- **Basin Yield**—As mentioned above, the northern portion of the Westside Basin may be able to yield a part of the 2,400 acre-feet of annual groundwater recharge that is currently not being used. The total groundwater extractions for the activities and current use cannot exceed 4,900 acre-feet per year. However, because of the declining water levels at Lake Merced, projects




Figure 7-6
*Range of Potential Activity Costs
in Westside Basin (northern portion)*

were not selected that would increase the amount of groundwater extracted from the lake's immediate vicinity.

- **Technical Feasibility**—In selecting the activities to consider further, the SFPUC evaluated the feasibility of installing new wells and using existing wells. Extraction wells need to be placed to avoid saltwater intrusion, to minimize pumping effects on the water levels at Lake Merced and other surface water bodies in the area, and to be suitably positioned within the aquifers to extract large volumes of groundwater (i.e., areas with large saturated thicknesses and high hydraulic conductivities).

- **Location of User**—Activities designed to serve individual users had to be located in areas that were technically feasible. In addition, developing systems for individual users who plan to use recycled water in the long-term was not practical; therefore, potential individual users had to be committed to long-term groundwater use.
- **Location Relative to Existing Distribution Network**—For activities where groundwater is to be sent to more than one user, the location of the activity became important. The closer the new or existing wells were to the existing water distribution system, the less infrastructure would be needed and the lower the cost of producing water.

Activity 5A1: Extract Groundwater from Elk Glen Well; Add to Main Distribution System

Use of the existing Elk Glen Well (Figure 7-7) for groundwater extraction was selected based on the estimated low cost of the water produced (See Figure 7-6) and the short time required for implementation. Implementation of this activity depends, however, on (1) the concurrence of the Recreation and Park Department and its coordination of use of the well until recycled water is available, and (2) verification that the well meets municipal well construction standards. If neither of these conditions can be met, a new well may be constructed adjacent to the existing wells or at an alternative location, pro-

viding groundwater at a slightly higher cost and with a longer implementation period. Groundwater extracted from the Elk Glen Well would be chlorinated and added to the main distribution system (30-inch-diameter pipeline). Within the main distribution system, groundwater would blend with imported water before distribution to potable water users to minimize taste differences between the two water supplies. If the existing Elk Glen Well is not used for potable supply, it will probably be retained by Parks and Recreation for backup irrigation supply.




Figure 7-7
Conceptual Configuration, Activity 5A1

Additional testing is needed to confirm the water quality at the Elk Glen Well. One sample in 1990 indicated that nitrate levels in groundwater were slightly above the maximum contaminant level (MCL) of 45 milligrams per liter (mg/L); in a subsequent sampling event in 1993, nitrates were below the MCL. If groundwater at the Elk Glen Well does not meet Title 22 Drinking Water Standards, additional treatment or blending may be required prior to injection into the main distribution system. If drinking water standards are met, California Department of Health Services will allow direct injection of groundwater into the system.

Activity 5A2: Extract Groundwater from the Sunset District; Add to Main Distribution System

The SFPUC will install two new municipal wells in the Sunset District in the vicinity of 44th Avenue (Figure 7-8). These wells will each pump an estimated 200-250 gallons per minute (gpm). The results of Activity 1A1 (Evaluate potential for saltwater intrusion) will be used to finalize the location and rate of operation of the proposed wells.

Groundwater extracted by these new wells will be chlorinated and then added to the main distribution system where it will blend with the surface water already in the system before distribution to City users. This activity is a cost-effective way to develop a groundwater supply and minimize the potential change in taste.




Figure 7-8
Conceptual Configuration, Activity 5A2

Strategy 5B: Capture Groundwater Produced by Dewatering Operations

Groundwater levels in many parts of the Downtown Basin are high. In many low-lying portions, groundwater levels are higher than basements, and pumping is required to keep basements or subsurface facilities dry, such as Bay Area Rapid Transit (BART) stations (Figure 7-9). Although some facilities, such as the California State Automobile Association Building at 100 Van Ness

Avenue, have installed dual plumbing systems to use the extracted groundwater for nonpotable uses, in most cases the groundwater is disposed of in the sewer.

Table 7-2 summarizes activities evaluated for capturing groundwater extracted by dewatering operations. Nine of these activities could supply dewatering water to individual nonpotable users (recycled water is not planned for the Downtown Basin area), and for one activity dewatering water could be added to the City's AWSS to be used for firefighting.




Figure 7-9
High Groundwater Levels in the Downtown Basin

Four of the five criteria used to evaluate the potential Westside Basin activities were also used to evaluate the Downtown Basin potential activities. These criteria included a reasonable cost of producing and distributing the water, technical feasibility, water quality, and the proximity of the users and the distribution system to the

location of the dewatering systems. Based on these criteria, the SFPUC has elected to pursue the two activities shaded in Table 7-2. In addition, two other activities may identify potential sources of dewatering water in the Downtown Basin.

Table 7-2 Potential Activities for Capturing Groundwater Produced by Dewatering Operations (Downtown Basin)					
User Group	Activity	Assumptions	Benefits	Amount (ac-ft/yr)	Potential Constraints (Institutional)
AWSS Network Users (Without Treatment)	Put water from Powell St. BART and other dewatering sites to AWSS		Replace imported potable supply being used for nonpotable with groundwater	225	Fire Department cooperation needed
Individual NonPotable Users (Without Treatment)	Install well at Alta Plaza Park	Onsite well location exists	Replace imported potable supply being used for nonpotable with groundwater	24	Incentive to User? Water Quality Issues; Lack of Distribution System
	Install well at Civic Center Plaza	Onsite well location exists	Replace imported potable supply being used for nonpotable with groundwater	12	Incentive to User? Water Quality Issues; Lack of Distribution System
	Install well at Hamilton Playground	Onsite well location exists	Replace imported potable supply being used for nonpotable with groundwater	9	Incentive to User? Water Quality Issues; Lack of Distribution System
	Install well at Jefferson Square	Onsite well location exists	Replace imported potable supply being used for nonpotable with groundwater	11	Incentive to User? Water Quality Issues; Lack of Distribution System
	Install well at Kimball Playground	Onsite well location exists	Replace imported potable supply being used for nonpotable with groundwater	10	Incentive to User? Water Quality Issues; Lack of Distribution System
	Install well at Margaret Hayward Playground	Onsite well location exists	Replace imported potable supply being used for nonpotable with groundwater	10	Incentive to User? Water Quality Issues; Lack of Distribution System
	Install well at Union Square	Onsite well location exists	Replace imported potable supply being used for nonpotable with groundwater	6	Incentive to User? Water Quality Issues; Lack of Distribution System
	Install well at Moscone Center	Onsite well location exists	Replace imported potable supply being used for nonpotable with groundwater	50	Incentive to User? Water Quality Issues; Lack of Distribution System
	Use existing sludgeline to North Point WWTP	DPW will be restoring line	Provide nonpotable to WWTP for sedimentation tank flushing	Unknown	The line is discontinuous
Note: Shaded activities are discussed in text of this report. Those not shaded were not considered further and may be considered in future projects.					

Activity 5B1: Add Groundwater to the AWSS from Dewatering at the Powell Street BART

In this activity, the SFPUC will capture groundwater from the Powell Street BART dewatering system and put it in the AWSS for the Fire Department to use for firefighting. An estimated 150 acre-feet per year (based on December 1990 flow rates) can be captured from the Powell Street BART Station for beneficial use.

During periods of nonuse, the AWSS requires an average of 225 acre-feet per year of water to compensate for normal pipeline leakage and to maintain adequate pressure within the system. This activity provides a dual benefit because it reduces the amount of treated water added to the AWSS and reduces the water currently added to the sewer by the dewatering operation. The SFPUC is coordinating with the Fire Department regarding implementation of this activity.

Activity 5B2: Identify Permanent Dewatering Operations in the City and Identify Potential Beneficial Uses of the Water

Many sites in the City are known to be undergoing dewatering. During Activity 5B2, these sites will be identified, where possible. Beneficial uses of this water will be further evaluated to identify cost-effective and technically feasible options. Water quality testing will be needed at each of the sites (in conjunction with the RWQCB) to determine limitations of use or needed treatment. As will be the case with Activity 5B1, use of dewatering water for

beneficial nonpotable uses will also reduce the amount of water sent to the sewer for treatment.

Activity 5B3: Develop Procedures to Put Temporary Construction Dewatering Water to Beneficial Use

Temporary (duration of days to months) dewatering is also common during construction of buildings, pipelines, or other activities with deep excavations. Procedures will be developed that could be incorporated into applications for building permits and other project approval permits to require evaluation of potential beneficial uses for water produced during temporary dewatering operations. These procedures would include testing requirements and possible beneficial uses to be considered by the applying contractor in a building permit application.

Activity 5B4: Evaluate the Feasibility of Using, and Implement if Appropriate, the Existing Sludge Line to Convey Non Potable Water to the North Point Plant

Some activities at the North Point Water Pollution Control Plant (WPCP) currently use potable water and could use nonpotable water if it could be supplied to the plant. The primary plant use of this nonpotable water is flushing of the sedimentation tanks (six tanks with a volume of 850,000 gallons each), but other uses may arise after the plant's design modifications are complete. Nonpotable water could also be used at the North Shore Pump Station, which pumps stormwater to either the North Point WPCP or the Southeast WPCP.

A former sludge line runs from the intersection of Army and Indiana Streets to the North Point plant. The integrity of this line was tested in 1992 (City of San Francisco, 1994), but the results were inconclusive. Portions of the line have been relocated or replaced by DPW and the California Department of Transportation (Caltrans). The line is expected to be restored in 1997, after which this line could be retested to see if it is usable as a means of transporting nonpotable water obtained from Activities 5B2 or 5B3 to the North Point Plant. This would provide beneficial uses for water from dewatering operations and would reduce the potable water demand at the plant.

Strategy 5C: Operate Groundwater Basins Conjunctively

The SFPUC and the other entities in shared groundwater basins have identified conjunctive use of groundwater basins as a long-term strategy that could help meet the goal of increasing groundwater use. Conjunctive use of water resources is the planned and coordinated use of groundwater and surface water supplies. In the City's case, one potential implementation of conjunctive use strategy is use of groundwater basins as storage reservoirs by directly recharging the basins with water during wet years when surplus water is available, and using the groundwater for potable water supply during dry years when other water supplies are limited (Figure 7-10). A second potential conjunctive use approach is in-lieu recharge, where surface water is supplied to a groundwater user during periods when surplus surface water is available. The groundwater that remains in storage (i.e., is not pumped) is then extracted during years of need.

Subsurface outflows to the San Francisco Bay or the Pacific Ocean from each basin could be captured and used




Figure 7-10
Conceptual Approach to Conjunctive Use
of San Francisco's Groundwater Basins

to replace or augment existing surface water supplies. Surplus surface water could also be used for recharge water.

Preliminary evaluations of the potential application of conjunctive use strategies have been conducted by the SFPUC for three basins: Westside, Lobos, and Downtown. Both the Westside and the Lobos Basins have been identified by the SFPUC as having high potential for implementing potable water conjunctive use strategies. The SFPUC has developed activities to evaluate each of these two basins for conjunctive use opportunities. Conjunctive use within the Downtown Basin is not considered further by the Groundwater Master Plan because the water in the Downtown Basin is nonpotable and the

infrastructure to transport nonpotable water within the Downtown Basin is not planned as part of the Recycled Water Master Plan (City and County of San Francisco, 1995).

Activity 5C1: Conduct In-Lieu Recharge of the Southern Portion of the Westside Basin

The SFPUC has discussed with the Cities of Daly City and San Bruno and with the California Water Service Company the potential development of an in-lieu recharge program for the southern portion of the Westside Basin. The purpose of this program is to minimize potential impacts from intensive groundwater pumping and promote recovery of drought-depleted groundwater reserves. One option being considered is for the SFPUC to provide surface water to pumpers in the southern portion of the Westside Basin in exchange for their ceasing or reducing their pumping of groundwater and allowing the aquifer to recharge. The stored water would be withdrawn by the pumpers during periods of surface water supply shortages in lieu of purchasing a like amount of water from the SFPUC. This water exchange could provide relief to declining Lake Merced water levels.

Activity 5C2: Conduct Conjunctive Use in the Lobos Basin

The City will evaluate the Lobos Basin to determine the most appropriate approach to implementing conjunctive use practices there. Existing information, findings from Activities 5D1 (Develop and implement a study of the Lobos Basin) and 3B1 (Assess effects of groundwater

development on Lobos Creek), and needs of the SFPUC will be used to evaluate the approach to managing the groundwater resources of the Lobos Basin. Possible approaches to the conjunctive use of the basin include in-lieu recharge by supplying surface water to replace the direct groundwater extraction by the Park Service (estimated to be 530 acre-feet per year) or direct recharge of surplus surface water supplies for long-term storage. Injection wells will be considered as a possible method of directly recharging the basin.

Strategy 5D: Investigate Other Groundwater Basins

As discussed in Section 2, groundwater in the Marina, South, Visitacion Valley, and Islais Valley Basins is generally undeveloped, and data on hydrogeologic properties and water quality are limited. Additional investigations are needed in these basins to determine whether there are potential potable or nonpotable groundwater uses within each of them. A hydrogeologic investigation is also planned for the Lobos Basin to evaluate the additional groundwater development potential of the basin. The SFPUC has therefore identified two short-term activities for further investigation of these City groundwater basins for future development.

Activity 5D1: Develop and Implement a Study of the Lobos Basin

As previously mentioned, groundwater in the portion of the Lobos Basin underlying the Presidio is managed by the NPS. Groundwater is now used, along with water

from Lobos Creek, to supply the Presidio's potable water demand. The SFPUC will conduct a study of the Lobos groundwater basin to determine how groundwater use at the Presidio affects groundwater levels and quality in Lobos Basin, to evaluate potential SFPUC use of the basin, to assess the relationship of the creek to the basin, and to confirm estimates of Lobos Basin existing recharge and extraction rates. This study may be conducted either independently or jointly with the NPS and may include the installation of monitoring wells, groundwater sampling, metering of Lobos Creek flows, and basin groundwater flow modeling. Information from this study will be used to support Activities 3B1 (Assess effects of groundwater development on Lobos Creek) and 5C2 (Conduct conjunctive use in the Lobos Basin).

Activity 5D2: Develop and Implement Studies of Other Shared and City Basins

The SFPUC will develop and implement studies in each of the four remaining groundwater basins (South, Visitacion Valley, Islais Valley, and Marina Basins) as part of the overall effort to increase groundwater use within the City. Results of these studies will provide information to the SFPUC regarding whether the groundwater in these basins can be developed for potable or nonpotable uses. These studies would be conducted to support Phase II implementation of the Recycled Water Master Plan, which may temporarily use groundwater in the southwest portions of the City.

Preliminary indications are that the potential groundwater use of these basins is lower than that of the Westside, Downtown, and Lobos Basins. However, use of these basins may assist the SFPUC in meeting its long-term strategies and goals. Current plans do not call for studies of these other City basins within the next 5 years, but when performed they will provide the City with the information to evaluate their potential use. These studies may involve the following tasks:

- Install new groundwater wells
- Collect and analyze water quality and water level measurements from new and existing wells
- Conduct and analyze aquifer tests
- Conduct laboratory tests of soil samples collected during well installation (including tests for permeability, sieve analyses, and organic content)
- Analyze data collected during the studies (including developing geologic cross sections and groundwater flow modeling)

Data collected during the basin studies will be added to the Geographic Information System (GIS) database developed for this Master Plan. Additional studies may be conducted on one or more basins depending on the results of the first study. Before groundwater development is implemented, proposed activities will undergo a project-specific environmental review to identify possible environmental impacts. The SFPUC's objective is to increase groundwater use without causing adverse environmental impacts.

Strategy 5E: Evaluate Other Potential Activities for Increasing Groundwater Use

Although Strategies 5A through 5C evaluate most of the potential activities for increasing groundwater use in the Westside and Downtown Basins, a number of smaller-scale potential activities remain. These consist of using groundwater in the City's decorative fountains and pools, and assessing whether groundwater could be used to treat pockets of water that could cause pipe erosion in the City's water distribution system. Under this strategy, the SFPUC will evaluate these potential activities.

Activity 5E1: Evaluate, and Implement Where Feasible, Potential Groundwater Use in the City's Fountains and Decorative Pools

There are a number of fountains and decorative pools on both public and private properties around the City. The most notable of these are the lagoon at the Palace of Fine Arts; the Civic Center ponds; and the fountains at Justin Herman Plaza, the Chevron Building, the Hyatt Regency

Hotel, the Marriott Hotel, and the Transamerica Building. Using groundwater in these fountains and pools would free up potable water for other uses and, in some cases, allow the pools and fountains to be used in drought years. The SFPUC will evaluate the potential use of groundwater at these locations.

Activity 5E2: Evaluate, and Implement Where Feasible, the Potential for Groundwater to Help Control Corrosion in the City's Water Distribution System

The City's water distribution system currently contains localized areas of water that could cause pipe corrosion and, eventually, pipe leaks. The SFPUC will evaluate whether blending groundwater with this system water would inhibit the corrosion process. The activity may include installing additional wells, analyzing groundwater samples, conducting baseline tests to evaluate the interaction between blended surface water and groundwater with the distribution system, and comparing groundwater quality with system water quality to identify any locations where blending of the two water sources would benefit system maintenance by lowering the potential for pipe corrosion.

Section Eight - Implementation and Financing

The purpose of this section is to summarize capital and operation and maintenance (O&M) costs, discuss the implementation schedule with respect to financing issues, and evaluate likely sources of funding for the 30 short-term activities identified in this Master Plan. These short-term activities will support the SFPUC's long-term strategies and goals for managing, developing, and using the City's groundwater resources.

Short-Term Activity Costs

The costs of short-term activities are summarized in Table 8-1 in 1997 dollars and, therefore, do not include the effects of inflation. Additionally, other activities may be identified during the course of implementing this Master Plan, which, if implemented, could result in increased costs for the program. Capital costs include design, construction, and one-time items such as implementation of a ground-

management group. The O&M costs are the projected annual costs to operate the activities included in each goal at full implementation, which occurs in year 5. The distribution of these costs in years 1 through 5 are discussed below under program financing.

The estimated costs per acre-foot of water for these activities are shown in Table 8-2. Only three of the short-term activities will directly produce estimated quantities of additional water. These three, all part of Goal 5, are capital-intensive and range in cost from approximately \$222 per acre-foot to \$569 per acre-foot, compared to a 1997 delivered water cost from the City's surface water supply of \$525 per acre-foot. The other 27 short-term activities will either produce variable amounts of water (Activity 4A2—Design, install, and operate large-capacity standby wells, if appropriate) or are expected to indirectly yield additional water and/or associated benefits.

Table 8-1 Summary of Known Short-Term Activity Costs (in 1997 dollars)						
Type of Cost	Management Activities			Development & Use Activities		Total Cost
	Goal 1	Goal 2	Goal 3	Goal 4	Goal 5	
Capital Costs	\$1,211,000	\$105,000	\$438,000	\$2,741,000	\$4,863,000	\$9,358,000
Annual O&M Costs at Full Implementation (Year 5)	168,000	252,000	0	270,000	367,000	1,057,000

Table 8-2 Estimated Cost per Acre-Foot for Short-Term Activities (in 1997 dollars)					
Short-Term Activity	Annualized Capital Cost ^a	Annual O&M Cost	Total Annual Cost	Estimated Ac-Ft/Yr	Estimated Cost/Ac-Ft
5A1-Extract groundwater from Elk Glen Well; add to main distribution system	\$ 78,000	\$122,000	\$200,000	900	\$222
5A2-Extract groundwater from the Sunset District; add to main distribution system	249,000	207,000	455,000	800	569
5B1-Add groundwater to the AWSS from dewatering at the Powell Street BART station	14,000	38,000	52,000	150	347

^aCapital costs shown as debt service. Activities funded by capital reserves have an annualized capital cost similar to revenue bond debt service, (i.e., with a 7 percent interest rate and 25-year repayment period) except that issuance and reserve costs are excluded.

Implementation Schedule

As shown in Figures 8-1 and 8-2, the SFPUC will implement or construct the short-term activities currently identified over the next 5 years. This schedule

assumes that all 30 of the proposed short-term activities will be financed using the combined revenue bond/pay-as-you-go funding approach discussed below. However, the SFPUC may change this schedule as additional activities are identified and various short-term activities are modified.





Figure 8-1
Implementation Schedule for Short-Term
Groundwater Management Activities



BAW 35516 MP ZZ Figure 8-2 (4-95 revision) 5-5-95sbm

Figure 8-2
Implementation Schedule for Short-Term Groundwater Development and Use Activities

Program Financing

The SFPUC will need to fund both the annual O&M costs and capital costs of the short-term activities for the management activities (Goals 1, 2, and 3) and the development and use activities (Goals 4 and 5). However, different funding mechanisms will be needed for each. The SFPUC's basic water service charges will fund O&M costs, while revenue bonds and/or capital improvement reserves will be used to fund the capital costs.

In addition to the type of funding mechanism, the SFPUC will consider two other factors related to program financing. The first is the effect of inflation on future costs. Table 8-1 summarizes costs in 1997 dollars, but inflation will increase the costs incurred after 1997. The second factor is the cost associated with long-term financing, such as revenue bonds. Although revenue bonds initially reduce the annual funding requirements by spreading the costs over the repayment period, they also carry a longer-term commitment, and the required issuance costs and bond reserves increase the principal amount to be funded. Both of these factors will

affect the SFPUC's annual budgets and, therefore, are included in the following discussions.

Revenue also will be generated by this project. The SFPUC will be able to sell the water produced by this project to wholesale and retail customers or to sell the surface water that will be replaced by groundwater. This revenue has not been estimated at this time or considered when developing the cost of implementing this Master Plan.

Funding of O&M Costs

The basic source of funding for annual O&M costs is the SFPUC's water service charge. As shown in Table 8-1, at full implementation (year 5) annual O&M costs reach a total of \$1,057,000 in 1997 dollars. When the effects of inflation are included, these costs increase to \$1.22 million by year 5, as shown in Table 8-3.

When the annual O&M costs shown in Table 8-3 are added to the SFPUC's annual revenue requirements, basic water service charges may go up. If rate increases are not viable, or if SFPUC operating budgets are restricted, these O&M activities are likely to be evaluated in terms of their cost-effectiveness and may need to compete with other SFPUC activities for funding. However, Activity 2C1 (Form appropriate AB 3030 management committee[s]) addresses the formation of a groundwater management committee under AB 3030 legislation, and one of the issues to be addressed is the equitable allocation of costs among member governmental jurisdictions and user groups. Reallocation of some O&M costs to other groups would reduce the impacts of these short-term activities on the SFPUC's water rates.

Table 8-3
Projected Annual O&M Costs for Short-Term Activities

	Short-Term Implementation Period				
	Year 1	Year 2	Year 3	Year 4	Year 5
Management Activities					
Goal 1	\$0	\$175,000	\$182,000	\$189,000	\$197,000
Goal 2	0	0	262,000	273,000	283,000
Goal 3	0	0	0	0	0
Development and Use Activities					
Goal 4	0	0	0	304,000	316,000
Goal 5	0	0	0	0	429,000
Total Annual O&M Costs	\$0	\$175,000	\$444,000	\$766,000	\$1,225,000
Note: It is assumed that the City will fund all O&M costs of short-term activities from annual operating budgets. Costs include inflation, which is assumed to be 4 percent per year.					

Funding of Capital Costs

The two basic approaches the SFPUC is likely to use to finance the capital costs of these short-term activities are (1) pay-as-you-go, which would use current year revenues and existing capital improvement reserves for capital costs, and (2) a combined revenue bond/pay-as-you-go approach, with revenue bonds used to finance the larger projects and annual revenues/capital improvement reserves to finance the smaller projects. Projected annual costs under each of these approaches are discussed below.

Pay-As-You-Go Financing. If the SFPUC uses a pay-as-you-go approach to fund all capital costs for the short-term activities included in Goals 1 through 5, the annual costs

would range from a low of \$559,000 in year 2 to a high of \$4.5 million in year 5, as shown at the bottom of Table 8-4. This range of costs indicates the need to use revenue bonds, or other long-term debt, to help reduce the peaks in the annual cash flow requirements.

Combined Revenue Bond/Pay-As-You-Go Approach.

All but two of the 30 short-term activities involve capital costs of less than \$2.5 million. These two exceptions are Activity 4A2 (Design, install and operate large-capacity standby wells, if appropriate), and Activity 5A2 (Extract groundwater from the Sunset District; add to main distribution system), with estimated costs of \$2.9 million (in 1997 dollars). These two activities would be financed with revenue bonds under this funding approach. Although the

Table 8-4 Projected Annual Funding Requirements for Short-Term Activities Using a Pay-As-You-Go Funding Approach					
	Short-Term Implementation Period				
	Year 1	Year 2	Year 3	Year 4	Year 5
Management Activities					
Goal 1	\$1,125,000	\$ 59,000	\$ 33,000	\$ 0	\$ 0
Goal 2	45,000	39,000	23,000	0	0
Goal 3	316,000	112,000	12,000	0	0
Development and Use Activities					
Goal 4	14,000	22,000	2,925,000	0	0
Goal 5	317,000	152,000	281,000	1,491,000	3,292,000
Total Capital Costs	1,817,000	384,000	3,274,000	1,491,000	3,292,000
Total O&M Costs (from Table 8-3)	0	175,000	444,000	766,000	1,225,000
Total Annual Costs	\$1,817,000	\$559,000	\$3,718,000	\$2,257,000	\$4,517,000
Note: This table assumes that the City funds the capital costs of short-term activities entirely from capital improvement of other existing revenue funds rather than revenue bonds. Costs include inflation, which is assumed to be 4 percent per year.					

SFPUC prefers to fund most of the short-term activities through existing capital improvement reserves, use of revenue bonds to finance additional activities may be necessary because of cash flow constraints.

In developing the implementation schedule and financing plan, the SFPUC has considered both the amount funded through revenue bonds and the implementation and construction activities. This provides a schedule that is manageable for the SFPUC staff, and one that does not exceed the SFPUC's capital improvement reserve funds.

Using revenue bonds to fund individual projects over \$2.5 million would result in a reasonable implementation schedule. Therefore, annual debt service payments are included instead of the entire capital cost for these two projects (4A2

and 5A2). The SFPUC has included issuance costs and reserve requirements of 15 percent of the principal for these projects, and assumed an interest rate of 7 percent and a 20-year repayment period in estimating the annual debt service.

The resulting annual cash-flow requirements for the capital costs using this combined revenue bond/pay-as-you-go approach are shown at the bottom of Table 8-5. As a result of including the annual O&M costs from Table 8-3 in this combined funding approach, the annual cash flow requirements would range from a minimum of approximately \$559,000 in year 2 to \$2.58 million in year 4.

The portion of the annual cash flow shown in Table 8-5 that is debt service on the revenue bonds for projects 4A2

Table 8-5 Projected Funding Requirements for Short-Term Activities Using a Combined Revenue Bond/Pay-As-You-Go Approach					
	Short-Term Implementation Period				
	Year 1	Year 2	Year 3	Year 4	Year 5
Management Activities					
Goal 1	\$1,125,000	\$ 59,000	\$ 33,000	\$ 0	\$ 0
Goal 2	45,000	39,000	23,000	0	0
Goal 3	316,000	112,000	12,000	0	0
Development and Use Activities					
Goal 4	14,000	22,000	318,000	318,000	318,000
Goal 5	317,000	152,000	281,000	1,491,000	357,000
Total Capital Costs	1,817,000	384,000	667,000	1,809,000	675,000
Total O&M Costs (from Table 8-3)	0	175,000	444,000	766,000	1,225,000
Total Annual Costs	\$1,817,000	\$559,000	\$1,111,000	\$2,575,000	\$1,900,000
Note: It is assumed that the City will use revenue bonds to finance all individual projects over \$2.5 million. Therefore, the annual debt service payments are included here for projects 4A2 and 5A2, which assume that issuance costs and reserve requirements will add 15 percent to the principal on these bonds. These costs include inflation, which is assumed to be 4 percent per year.					

and 5A2 totals \$675,000, compared to \$6.2 million if these projects were funded with capital improvement reserves. These bonds entail an issuance of \$3.4 million in year 3 and \$3.8 million in year 5, as shown in Table 8-6.

The annual cash flow requirements in both the pay-as-you-go approach (Table 8-4) and the combined revenue bond/pay-as-you-go approach (Table 8-5) assume that the short-term activities involving construction will begin operation

immediately after construction. Development and use projects are expected to operate continuously from startup into the foreseeable future, except for those involving finite studies such as Activities 4A1 (Study the feasibility of installing large-capacity standby wells), 4A3 (Update the SFPUC's Emergency Operations Plan), and 5B2 (Identify permanent dewatering operations in the City and identify potential beneficial uses for the water). These and other finite studies are expected to be completed within a year.

Table 8-6 Revenue Bond Funded Portion of Short-Term Capital Costs Using a Combined Revenue Bond/Pay-As-You-Go Approach		
	Revenue Bond Funding	
	Bond Principal^a and Issuance Date	Annual Debt Service^b
Management Activities		
Goal 1	\$0	\$0
Goal 2	\$0	\$0
Goal 3	\$0	\$0
Development and Use Activities		
Goal 4	\$3.4 million/Year 3	\$318,000
Goal 5	\$3.8 million/Year 5	\$357,000
Total	\$7.2 million/Year 3-5	\$675,000
^a Assumes an additional 15 percent for costs of legal, issuance, and bond reserve requirements.		
^b Assumes a 7 percent interest rate and a 20-year repayment period.		

Section Nine - Works Cited

Applied Consultants. 1991. *Report on the Daly City Ground-Water Investigation and Model Study*. Prepared for the City of Daly City, California. July.

Bartell, M. J. 1913. *Underground Water Supply of San Francisco*. Prepared for the City of San Francisco.

Bookman-Edmonston Engineering Inc. 1992. *Subject Report of City and County of San Francisco Water Demands (excluding Suburban Customers)*. Draft. September 4.

California Department of Water Resources. 1994. *California Water Plan Update*. Volume 1. Bulletin 160-93. October.

California Regional Water Quality Control Board. 1994. *Database of Pollution Sites in San Francisco County*.

Clement, Humphrey S. 1853. Map of Northern Portion of San Francisco County.

Freeman, John R. 1912. *On the Proposed Use of a Portion of the Hetch Hetchy, Eleanor and Cherry Valleys Within and Near to the Boundaries of the Stanislaus U.S. National Forest Reserve and the Yosemite National Park as Reservoirs for Impounding Tuolumne River Flood Waters and Appurtenant Works for the Water Supply of San Francisco, California, and Neighboring Cities*. A report to James Rolph, Jr., Mayor of San Francisco, and Percy V. Long, City Attorney. July 15.

Geo/Resource Consultants, Inc. 1993. *Lake Merced Water Resource Planning Study*. Prepared for San Francisco Water Department. May.

National Park Service, U.S. Department of the Interior. 1994. *Final General Management Plan Amendment Environmental Impact Statement*. Golden Gate National Recreation Area, Presidio of San Francisco, San Francisco, California. July.

Phillips, Steven P., Scott N. Hamlin, and Eugene B. Yates. 1993. *Geohydrology, Water Quality, and Estimation of Ground-Water Recharge in San Francisco, California, 1978-92*. U.S. Geological Survey Water-Resources Investigations Report 93-4019. Prepared in cooperation with the San Francisco Water Department.

Pitometer Associates. 1961-1989. *District Measurements*. Coordinated by City Distribution Division of the San Francisco Water Department.

San Francisco, City and County of. 1995. *Draft Water Recycling Master Plan Apparent Best Alternative*. Prepared by Montgomery Watson. February.

_____. 1994a. *San Francisco Water and Power, A History of the Municipal Water Department and Hetch Hetchy System*.

_____. 1994b. Internal memorandum, November 17.

_____. 1993. *Response to Data Request Concerning FERC Opinion 4210*. Public Utilities Commission and Hetch Hetchy Water and Power Department. June 8.

_____. 1992. *Draft Water Recycling Master Plan*. Prepared by James M. Montgomery, Consulting Engineers, Inc. October.

San Francisco, City and County of, Department of Public Works. 1995. *San Francisco Zoological Gardens, Infrastructure Master Plan*. Prepared by Kennedy/Jenks Consultants-AGS Inc. December.

San Francisco, City and County of, Public Utilities Commission. 1996. *The Urban Water Management Plan for the City and County of San Francisco*. March.

San Francisco Recreation and Park Department. 1994. *Golden Gate Park Draft Master Plan*. Prepared by Royston, Hanamoto, Alley, and Abey. August.

San Francisco Water Department. 1993. *Emergency Operations Plan*. Prepared by EQE International. February.

U.C. BERKELEY LIBRARIES



C124922595

